UC-NRLF
$B 279 160
YB 17650

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Class

GENERAL

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/attitudeofgreekt00huddrich

THE ATTITUDE

OF THE

GREEK TRAGEDIANS TOWARD ART

THE ATTITUDE

OF THE

GREEK TRAGEDIANS TOWARD ART

BY

JOHN H. HUDDILSTON

B.A. (HARV.), PH.D. (MUNICH)

FORMERLY INSTRUCTOR IN GREEK IN THE NORTH WESTERN UNIVERSITY
AND AUTHOR OF 'THE ESSENTIALS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK'

London

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1898

All rights reserved

N5633
H8

Oxford
HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

GENERAL

TO

PROFESSORS

ADOLF FURTWÄNGLER

AND

WILHELM VON CHRIST

101973

PREFACE

Were Aischylos, Sophokles, and Euripides influenced by works of art, and, if so, to what extent? This monograph represents an attempt to answer this question so far as it is possible from our present archaeological knowledge. Although the nature of Greek tragedy was such as to practically exclude excursions on, or allusions to, works of art merely for art's sake, there is still a considerable element of this sort which, when studied from the standpoint of the archaeologist, contributes much toward a better understanding of the dramatists. It is not going too far to say that we are able to assign to Euripides at least a wholly unique position among ancient poets. Perhaps no writer except Lucian can lay claim to the appreciative taste for art which the youngest of the three tragedians manifests. Regarding Aischylos and Sophokles, likewise, certain hardly less interest-

ing facts may be observed. The two latter, however, have been included here not so much for what they have to give us in an archaeological way as to lend a sort of completeness to the discussion and to form a basis of comparison for Euripides by the study of whom I was drawn into the investigation.

This work appeared originally as a Doctor's thesis under the title 'Greek Art in Euripides, Aischylos, and Sophokles.' I send it out in its present form trusting that it may serve to throw some new light on a field as yet little noticed.

The Author wishes to express his thanks to Professors Wilhelm von Christ and A. Furtwängler for their valuable criticisms of the work while in manuscript form. Neither of these scholars is, however, responsible in any manner for errors which may be discovered in the interpretation either of the monuments or the poets.

MUNICH, *Nov.* 1897.

CONTENTS

PAGES

INTRODUCTION 1–5

AISCHYLOS—

SCULPTURE 5–12

PAINTING 12–19

ARCHITECTURE AND MISCELLANY . . 19–32

SOPHOKLES 32–38

EURIPIDES—

ARCHITECTURE 39–58

SCULPTURE 58–72

PAINTING 72–79

WEAVING AND EMBROIDERY 79–91

ACHILLES' ARMOR IN THE *ELEKTRA* . . 91–100

MISCELLANY 101–106

COMPARISON BETWEEN AISCHYLOS AND EURIPIDES 106–112

ART ELEMENT FOR THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *RHESOS* 112–117

THE COMMON ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE NOTES

Arch. Ztg. = *Archäologische Zeitung* (Berlin).

Athen. Mitth. = *Mittheilungen des K. deutschen archäologischen Instituts in Athen.*

Baumeister, *Denkmäler* = Baumeister's *Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums.*

B. C. H. = *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* (Athens).

Compte Rendu = *Compte Rendu de la Commission impériale archéologique* (St. Petersburg).

C. I. A. = *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum.*

Élite Céram. = *Élite des monuments céramographiques*, Lenormant et De Witte.

Furtwängler, *Masterpieces* = Furtwängler, *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture.*

Gerhard, *Auserl. Vasen.* = Gerhard, *Auserlesene griechische Vasenbilder.*

Jahrbuch = *Jahrbuch des K. deutschen archäologischen Instituts* (Berlin).

J. H. S. = *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (London).

Mon. d. Inst. = *Monumenti inediti pubblicati dall' Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica* (Rome).

Nauck, *Fragmenta* = Nauck, *Fragmenta tragicorum graecorum.* 2ed.

Overbeck, *Bildwerke* = Overbeck, *Die Bildwerke zum thebischen und troischen Heldenkreis.*

THE ATTITUDE OF THE GREEK TRAGEDIANS TOWARD ART

The many-sidedness of Euripides is sure to strike the reader with unusual force if he comes to him just after the study of Aischylos and Sophokles. While the two older tragedians remained true to the tragic muse and to the worship of Dionysos, the youngest member of the great triumvirate took to philosophy, rhetoric, and politics. He was, in short, a man of the world, whose last thought probably was the god at whose festivals his tragedies were presented. The result of all this is that Euripides serves as a sort of mirror in which one may see the complexity of the elements in Athenian life, and, as he was from first to last a true patriot who was deeply interested in every step of Athens'

successes and failures, his tendency to introduce every-day affairs in his work possesses a double charm for us. The issues which concerned the Athenians were the same which concerned him and inspired much that he wrote. He dealt with his present in a way that neither one of his great compeers had done. Judged from what had gone before, this was certainly a degradation of tragedy, a pulling down of the institution which had long been the church and public educator, and yet the future profited far more from these innovations than it would have done had Euripides followed strictly the orthodox form of tragic composition. Actual happenings being once given a place in the theatre, nothing could henceforth constrain the tragedian to hold only to the mythic cycles. The permanent drama which is based on human experiences and human interests must therefore be dated from Euripides. It is well known that his innovations have been censured or praised since his own contemporary, Aristophanes, turned the vials of his wrath upon him.

There is, however, just in this attitude of Euripides toward that which was going on around him, one phase as yet insufficiently noticed. I mean his interest in art. One may

search in vain through Euripidean literature for any thorough discussion of this point[1]. The tradition that he began life with the vocation of painter[2] usually finds its way into the handbooks on Greek literature and other works dealing with the Greek drama. Even this slight hold which we have for an artist Euripides is accepted by some as rather fiction than history[3]. At the most, one is not apt to associate this early bent for art with the later calling of tragedian. Scholars have seldom gone further with Euripides the artist than to call attention to the remarkable display of fine artistic taste in the opening scene of the *Ion*, and perhaps one or two other places. In the following pages the attempt has been made to present a picture of this side of the poet so far as it is possible from his extant work. Even though Euripides was not a painter, we are able to show that his point of view was that of one, and that nearly everything which has reached us from his plays is

[1] G. Kinkel's *Euripides und die bildende Kunst*, Berlin, 1872, is the only work upon this subject which is worth mentioning. This, however, does little more than to stimulate one's curiosity without satisfying it.

[2] Cf. *φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ζωγράφον γενέσθαι καὶ δείκνυσθαι αὐτοῦ πινάκια ἐν Μεγάροις* in the *γένος Εὐριπίδου*.

[3] Cf. Wilamowitz, *Euripides Herakles*, 1ed. Bd. 1, p. 19 f.

stamped in no uncertain manner by a fine feeling for architecture, plastic, painting, and the fine arts generally which reached the unparalleled degree of perfection in his immediate surroundings. This is all the more striking when compared with the attitude of any other classical Greek writer towards the development of Athenian art. It would not surprise us to find Aischylos uninterested in the monuments of his time. He belonged to that early period when Athens had not yet entered upon her recognized leadership in this field. But if Aischylos knew no Parthenon, and therefore no Pheidias or Iktinos with all which they stood for, the same cannot be said of Sophokles, whose life spanned the whole period in which Greek art attained its wonderful perfection [1]. Sensible though he may have been of the splendor of the monuments which enriched Athens during the latter half of his lifetime, Sophokles does not give much evidence of artistic feeling. His characters never describe any work of art, nor do his choruses take any liberty in this direction. When we pass to Euripides, however, the change

[1] I am aware of course that these men had reached a certain celebrity before Aischylos' death, but the zenith of their fame came years afterward.

is striking. Here the art of the time is reflected in such a way as to distinguish Euripides sharply from the two others if no further elements entered into the consideration. With him it is a sort of necessity to allude to temples or embroidered robes worked in rich colors. One is transported involuntarily to the time when the artistic activity of Athens was at its height. In order, however, to value Euripides correctly, it is necessary to consider in detail the archaeological element in Aischylos and Sophokles. I proceed therefore to review the two latter in their relation to Greek art.

To begin with plastic in Aischylos, we take the striking passage where the chorus expands upon the sad situation of the lonely Menelaos in his Spartan palace. A vision of Helen possesses the home, while

> εὐμόρφων δὲ κολοσσῶν
> ἔχθεται χάρις ἀνδρί[1].

I understand this κολοσσῶν to refer to Helen's busts or images which adorned the palace rooms, portrait work, in short, to which Aischylos refers[2]. Ideal statues would have little significance in the connexion in which the chorus

[1] *Agam.* vs. 416 f.

[2] Cf. ξύλινοι κολοσσοί in Herod. 2. 130.

employs the term. Everything points in some way to the truant Helen, and a lifeless reference to the palace decorations would stand for little in a place where the poet is doing his utmost to picture Menelaos alone in the haunts made doubly 'hateful' by the charms of the marble. The passage finds a sort of parallel in the *Alkestis*, where Admetos will have his wife's image made and will embrace this as in fact his wife[1].

As the most important works of statuary are met with under the terms ἄγαλμα and βρέτας, it is essential to inquire into the significance of these words as used by the three poets. As regards the former, the Homeric sense πᾶν ἐφ' ᾧ τις ἀγάλλεται, i.e. 'decoration,' 'adornment,' 'joy,' 'pleasure,' still obtains in Aischylos, while βρέτας stands regularly for the temple image or votive statue. We find ἄγαλμα='statue' in Aischylos but three times, twice as a plain variation on βρέτας, which had otherwise been too monotonous[2], and once as signifying the later 'statue' meaning of the word[3]. The old and sacred cultus-images are especially denoted by βρέτας even in Euripides as well. With the

[1] Eur. *Alk.* vs. 348 ff. [2] *Sept.* vs. 258, 265.
[3] *Eumen.* v. 55.

latter, however, there appears not only this exclusively religious tone which clings to βρέτας all the way through and to ἄγαλμα in Aischylos and Sophokles (βρέτας does not occur in the latter), but there begins to appear the general 'image' or 'statue' meaning of ἄγαλμα, not necessarily a cultus-image, but quite as well any work of statuary. It is, in other words, the Pausaniac sense of the term that makes its appearance[1].

It is only in the *Eumenides* that Aischylos comes to a definite monument signified by βρέτας[2]. The old image of Athena, fabled to have fallen from Heaven[3], and which stood for so much in the worship of the Athenians, furnishes the pivotal point about which the action of the latter part of the tragedy turns.

[1] Overbeck, in *Berichte der sächsischen Akademie*, 1864, p. 242 ff., has failed to recognize the non-religious significance of ἄγαλμα in Euripides, and has simply thrown together in a confusing way all occurrences of the word in this poet as meaning *Götterbilder*. What has the word in *Hek.* v. 560, *Phoin.* v. 220, and *Androm.* fr. 125, and *Eurys.* fr. 372 to do with *Götterbilder*? When these occurrences and others similar are subtracted from the 19 which he cites, the result is that βρέτας represents the *Götterbild* more frequently, and modifies his conclusion that ἄγαλμα is thus more often used in post-epic writers. Cf. also Fränkel, *De verbis potioribus quibus opera statuaria graeci notabant*, Berlin, 1873, who likewise misunderstands ἄγαλμα in Eur. *Hek.* v. 560, and speaks of a *simulacrum deae*, p. 17.

[2] *Eumen.* vs. 80, 242.

[3] Paus. 1. 26. 6.

It is necessary to bear in mind that no gold-ivory statue of Athena was before the mind of the poet. No Pheidias had yet fixed the Athena type. As the latter creation remained for the Greeks and Romans the Athena κατ' ἐξοχήν, so, for the Greeks prior to Pheidias' time, *the* statue was the sacred image in the 'Old Temple.' No qualifying term was necessary to assure its being understood. *The* temple, *the* sanctuary, *the* image were not to be mistaken[1]. The nature of this statue, and whether the figure sat or stood, it is not possible to determine. We come nearest to the character of it *perhaps* in the archaic terra cottas which have been found on the Acropolis. By far the most considerable number of these represent Athena, both in a sitting and standing posture[2].

There can be little question but that these early terra cottas are reproductions of the larger cultus-images. In this case the frequently occurring Athena sitting on a broad-backed seat with extending arms may represent more

[1] Cf. Dörpfeld in *Athen. Mitth.* 1887, p. 190 ff.

[2] Winter, *Arch. Anz.* 1892, p. 142, where no. 6 shows the charging Athena, no. 16 the sitting type with the gorgon painted on the breast. Cf. also Roscher's *Lexikon*, p. 687, and Harrison, *Monuments and Mythology of Ancient Athens*, p. 495, where the well-known terra cotta from Stackelberg's *Gräber der Hellenen*, pl. 57, is reproduced.

or less exactly the ancient xoanon. From the time of Peisistratos at least it is probable that the 'Old Temple' of Athena had its Polias statue which was more a work of art than the rude xoanon. We are unable to form any notion of either of these, either or both of which Aischylos may have had in mind, except as the terra cottas may furnish the suggestion. These small monuments were certainly dedicated in the gods' sanctuaries and were looked upon as standing for the god-head. Have we not a right therefore to conclude that the traditional forms of the temple images were retained? The wide influence which the larger monuments in marble exercised over the manufacture of terra cottas in the fourth century B.C. was likely not without its parallel in the early time. Jahn[1] used vs. 80 and 258 of the *Eumenides* to prove that the Athena xoanon represented the goddess as standing, and therefore another type from the Palladium at Troy, which, as it appears from Homer[2], was a sitting image. It seems to me, however, that the view taken by Furtwängler in Roscher's *Lexikon* has more to recommend it. The view expressed there is that Aischylos

[1] *De Antiquissimis Minervae simulacris Atticis*, p. 10.
[2] *Il.* 6, vs. 92 and 303.

is not adequate evidence for a standing image, and that the tradition of the sitting idol which is traceable from Homer to the time of the early terra cottas would lead us to think of the xoanon as also a sitting figure[1]. This most ancient type passed early out of recognition, however, and with vase painters Athena is invariably on her feet. Dörpfeld[2] argues that there was still in the sixth century B.C. a sitting and standing Athena image in vogue. One of these was in the Erechtheion, the other in the neighbouring 'Old Temple.' Supposing there were two images, it would seem that Aischylos had in mind only the old xoanon. He places it in the *δῶμα*[3] (v. 242). By this he could scarcely have meant the Erechtheus temple, which was in no sense an Athena temple till the new structure was built at the end of the fifth century B.C. He understands the 'Old Temple' of Athena, the *ἀρχαῖος νεώς*, whose discovery we owe to Dr. Dörpfeld. Here then was the old *βρέτας*. The relation of the latter to the Erechtheion in this early period does not appear to have

[1] Professor Furtwängler now believes that the xoanon represented a standing figure.

[2] *Athen. Mitth.* 1887, p. 28.

[3] So in v. 855 by *πρὸς δόμοις Ἐρεχθέως* the poet appears to distinguish the house of Erechtheus from the *δῶμα* of Pallas.

existed. When it was transferred to the latter temple I do not pretend to decide.

It remains to refer to the βρέτη of Zeus, Apollo, Hermes and Poseidon, which were about the κοινοβωμία in the *Supplices*[1]. The repeated use of ὅδε points to the presence of real statues[2], as does also the threat of the chorus that they will hang themselves as νέα πινάκια on the images rather than be delivered to their pursuers[3]. In the *Septem*[4], again, the crazed Theban women fly for refuge to the market and fall around the images of their city's gods. These are Zeus, Athena, Poseidon, Ares, Aphrodite, Apollo, Artemis and Hera, to all of whom they cling and address their supplications. It is to be observed that these were ἀρχαῖα[5], no doubt the old stiff images that were placed about the orchestra. This was unquestionably a wonderful pageant. Such resource to art to make the grandeur more grand and the impressive more impressive is

[1] vs. 211 ff. [2] vs. 463, 465.

[3] v. 465. It is not easy to see how Wilamowitz understands the sanctuary *nicht durch Götterbilder, aber durch Symbole der verschiedensten Götter ausgezeichnet* (*Hermes*, xxi. p. 609). What sense would there be in the chorus threatening to hang themselves on the images if they were mere attributes and not solid monuments?

[4] vs. 116 ff.; cf. also 95, 185, 212, 258, 265. [5] v. 211.

true Aischylean manner. It all corresponds with the great stage machinery which he invented to bring his gods out of Heaven and his ghosts out of Hades. All of the passages, however, point to no definite work of art. It is but the religious fervour of the poet pushing him on to make his gods objective things which could be touched and handled. The vagueness of the notion is well seen in the *Persai*[1], where the ghost of Dareios introduces the whole galaxy of Greek divinities under θεῶν βρέτη.

Aischylos exhibits an interest in paintings in various cases, and in two passages at least affords us the earliest literary testimony of two paintings which are known to have played a large rôle in ancient art. In the *Eumenides*, vs. 46 ff., the Pythian prophetess in relating to the chorus what she has beheld at the ὀμφαλός, says, 'a marvelous troop of women sleeps on the seats, and yet I do not mean women but Gorgons; nor shall I compare them indeed to the real Gorgon type:'

εἶδόν ποτ' ἤδη Φινέως γεγραμμένας
δεῖπνον φερούσας·

'for I once saw these represented in a painting, carrying off the food of Phineus.' And she

[1] v. 809.

follows with the distinction that the figures sleeping are wingless. In other words, the females, who in the picture were robbing Phineus of his dinner, were winged. The poet was, as this tells us, a careful observer, and not unmindful of the stories told in Greek art[1]. Among the earliest representations of the Phineus episode was the scene on the Kypselos chest[2] and on the throne of Apollo at Amyklai[3]. On each of these the Boreadai were pursuing the Harpies and thereby working the deliverance of Phineus[4]. Although the passage gives some evidence of having been altered, the allusion to the painting bespeaks both for Aischylos and his audience a very intimate acquaintance with the scene. It must have been a picture with which the average Athenian was well acquainted, else the failure of the writer to mention the females, i.e. the Harpies, had been a serious carelessness. The verses are indeed noteworthy as indicating what the poet of 458 B.C. demanded

[1] We know of a *Phineus* by Aischylos from which three fragments are preserved (cf. Nauck, p. 83).

[2] Paus. 5. 17. 11: *Φινεύς τε ὁ Θρᾷξ ἐστί, καὶ οἱ παῖδες οἱ Βορέου τὰς Ἁρπυίας ἀπ' αὐτοῦ διώκουσιν.*

[3] Paus. 3. 18. 15: *Κάλαϊς δὲ καὶ Ζήτης τὰς Ἁρπυίας Φινέως ἀπελαύνουσιν.*

[4] For the story, cf. Apoll. Rhod. ii. vs. 178 ff.

of his audience. They are supposed to comprehend the significance of Γοργείοισι τύποις, and this can refer to nothing other than art representations of the Gorgons, the accepted type of the creature in art and no longer the subjective Gorgon of a poet's fancy. Aischylos in short reflects here the absorbing interest in art which penetrated all classes of Athenians during the first part of the century.

In order to get at a thorough understanding of this passage it is necessary to review the vase paintings which preserve the scene for us. The earliest monument is an Attic vase in Berlin[1]. Although Phineus does not appear as far as the painting is preserved, there can be little doubt as to the meaning of the picture. The two winged Harpies, their name given, are running at high speed to the right. One has to think of course that the Boreadai were represented following, while from the comparison with the other paintings noticed below it is probable that Phineus himself was not wanting. The cup in the University Museum in Würzburg[2] shows

[1] Berlin, no. 1682. Published in *Arch. Ztg.* 1882, pl. 9. Cf. also Roscher's *Lexikon*, ii. p. 1843.

[2] Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* x. pl. 8; *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, Ser. c. pl. 8, 3[a]; Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, fig. 1485. Cf. Flasch in *Arch. Ztg.* 1880, p. 138 ff.

us the scene as it appeared on the Kypselos chest and the Amyklaian throne, with the exception that there are here three female figures standing at the foot and head of Phineus' couch. The sons of Boreas are in hot pursuit of the two Harpies, who do not appear to have succeeded in getting any of the food which lay on the table before the king. The Harpies are here winged also as in Aischylos[1]. Another painting, on an Attic hydria of *cir.* 420 B.C., gives the actual robbery[2]. The Harpies are hastening away with their hands full of the δεῖπνον, and, contrary to all other representations of them, they are given long garments and long, ponderous wings. The Boreadai are here on the right of the table. Still another vase, which has the episode in more extended form, is in the Jatta-Ruvo collection[3]. This is, so far as I know, the youngest representation of the scene, and is still scarcely later than the last decade

[1] Curiously enough, the scholiast remarks on this passage that the Harpies were not given wings in paintings.

[2] Stackelberg's *Gräber der Hellenen*, pl. 38, but incorrectly interpreted by S. A much better publication, together with the first correct reading, is found in Millingen, *Ancient Unedited Monuments*, pl. 15. The vase was formerly in a private collection in England, and is no doubt still in this country somewhere.

[3] No. 1095. Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* iii. pl. 49.

of the fifth century B.C.[1] The affair transpires here on the sea-shore in the presence of the Argonautic train. The whole is worked out with much of the detail which characterizes the account in Apollonios. But to come to the last vase, and again an Attic work, we have on the British Museum amphora[2] a picture which coincides remarkably with the words of Aischylos. Phineus reclines utterly helpless at the table, while his dinner is plundered by the two insolent Harpies. They are in full run with all that they can hold in their hands. No accessory figures are given, and nothing points to the least relief for the unfortunate Phineus. The vase (according to the author of the catalogue) is 'the late stage of the strong style.' Judging from the publication, I would not hesitate to date the vase *cir.* 460 B.C. The painting is at any rate but a very few years earlier than the production of the *Eumenides* and is, moreover, so closely in harmony with the εἶδον ... φερούσας of Aischylos that one is inclined to connect the two in some way. It is not too much to conclude that the two were dependent upon one and the same original.

[1] Cf. Furtwängler, *Masterpieces*, p. 109.

[2] Cat. vol. iii. no. 302. Published in *Arch. Ztg.* (but poorly), 1880, pl. 12. 2. Cf. *ibid.* p. 138.

The second passage which occurs in the first chorus of the *Agamemnon* is one of the finest in the whole extant work of Aischylos. The sacrifice of Iphigeneia at Aulis is being depicted. The guards had lifted her from the ground and had placed a gag in her fair mouth that she might utter no word to curse the family. Her robes of rich hue swept to the ground while

> ἔβαλλ' ἕκαστον θυτήρων
> ἀπ' ὄμματος βέλει φιλοίκτῳ,
> πρέπουσά θ' ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς, προσεννέπειν
> θέλουσ'[1].

This remarkably affecting scene was actually inspired by works of art. The poet has breathed into his words the inspiration of this very scene as he knew it in paintings or in some parallel where the pathos and tenderness of the victim's eyes struck the beholder as a new and unique triumph in the artistic. Such a sight as one meets in the Penthesileia kylix[2], where the plunging sword of Achilles is stayed by that pitiable and heart-rending appeal speaking from the Amazon's eyes, affords a slight notion of the paintings of this class which the poet knew. It

[1] *Agam.* vs. 240 ff.

[2] No. 370 in Munich coll., published by Overbeck, *Bildwerke*, pl. 17. 3; Gerhard, *Trinkschalen u. Gefässe*, pl. c. 4–6.

is further very probable that just this offering was a subject common with the artists of the time of Aischylos. One may recall the scene as it occurs on wall paintings [1] and on the round altar in the Ufizzi in Florence [2]. While the part of Agamemnon in the sacrifice as described by the chorus is, as far as possible, different from that in the extant monuments, the fact remains that one must look back to the earlier Greek art to locate the first appearance of the scene. Michaelis well points out that the conception of the middle group on the Ufizzi relief speaks for an original out of the Pheidian time [3]. In Aischylos, however, one meets the earliest authority for an art representation of Iphigeneia's death, and even though the monuments are more Euripidean in their feeling, the story was known in art as early at least as 458 B.C.[4]

There remain two passages still where painting serves the poet in a figure of speech. A person

[1] Helbig, *Campanische Wandmalerei*, nos. 1304, 1305; vid. s. Iphigeneia in Baumeister's *Antike Denk.* and Roscher's *Lexikon.*

[2] Amelung, *Führer durch die Antiken in Florenz*, no. 79; published in Baumeister, *Denk.* i. no. 806.

[3] *Röm. Mitth.* 1893, p. 201 ff., where the relation of the composition in this relief to that of the Orpheus relief in Naples is discussed.

[4] We cannot make out the nature of the *Iphigeneia in Aulis* of Aischylos. Cf. Nauck's *Fragmenta*, p. 31.

in adverse fortune may help himself from his sad situation by a simple stroke (i. e. suicide), just as one may rub out a painting with a moist sponge[1]. Again, Agamemnon made a very unpleasant sight in the eyes of Klytaimnestra when he was mustering an army to recover Helen. He was literally 'painted in a very distasteful manner[2].'

This then ends what one may learn out of the great dramatist concerning his taste for painting, and it must be recognized as not insignificant when compared with the same element in other Greek poets. His was the period in which Polygnotos lived and worked, and the greatest of Greek dramatists would appear to have been a worthy admirer of the most illustrious of ancient painters.

Aischylos was no builder, nor did he concern himself in referring to the work of the architect. Only once, indeed, did he feel the need of using even the indefinite word *νεώς*[3], and that when he alludes to the devastation

[1] *Agam.* v. 1328 f.

[2] *Agam.* v. 801. Frag. no. 142 gives us the word *ἐγκουράς* from the *Myrmidones*, explained by Hesychius as meaning *γραφικὸς πίναξ*—'a painted plaque.' We cannot make out its use in Aischylos.

[3] *Pers.* 811. In v. 404 *ἕδη* takes its place.

wrought by the Persians, who had pulled down the images of the gods and burned their temples. In the *Eumenides*, where the play opens with the Apollo temple at Delphi, there is not a word of comment upon the structure; not even a chance reference to a column. This, compared with the *Ion*[1] of Euripides, where the temple is of the first importance, is striking in simplicity. One feels that Aischylos had no time for unnecessary words. His one purpose is the pursuit of Orestes, and from the crucial test of the hour neither scenery nor architectural decorations are able to swerve him. What was the architectural Athens of Aischylos' time? The Persian invasion had worked havoc with the buildings out of the earlier time. 'The Old Temple' of Athena, together with the other structures, had all gone down in the ruin wrought by the invaders. These were unquestionably rebuilt either in whole or in part on the return of the Athenians from Salamis. The new buildings, however, rose slowly out of the pile of smoked and charred rubbish. Aischylos never saw anything of the Parthenon beyond the small beginnings commonly known as Kimonian[2].

[1] Cf. p. 41 ff.

[2] Furtwängler (*Masterpieces*, p. 420 ff.) argues very cogently

The mighty gate at the entrance to the Citadel was no suggestion of the glorious Propylaia of the later time. The one large temple of Athena was the only significant building on the Acropolis. In the lower city the principal work was probably the Theseion, which dated only from the poet's later years. The 'so-called Theseion' on Kolonos he never saw except perhaps in the very commencement of the work. Athens was, then, generally speaking, of small interest from an architect's point of view so long as Aischylos lived. There had been for architecture and sculpture no Polygnotos, and until the skill of some such brought forth the creations of the Periklean age, these elements were not to be reflected in the poet's verse.

In the *ὕφασμα* Aischylos recognizes simply the plainly woven stuff. The character is one and the same to him. He is not concerned with any special colors or patterns in the dress. All this we shall see is quite contrary to the spirit in Euripides, who never tires of giving one detail after another in the work of the loom. Aischylos

that the early Parthenon was begun under Themistokles' administration shortly after 479 B.C., and that we should speak of the Themistoklean Parthenon and not the Kimonian.

stops only once to arouse our curiosity[1]. Orestes cries to Electra: 'Behold this garment, thy hand's work; here the shuttle marks and the picture of wild beasts.' But this is all, and the poet proceeds without giving any clue as to what the γραφή was.

Under the head of miscellany I shall discuss the shield devices which are described in the *Septem*. The great variety in the character of these designs illustrates, as well as anything does, Aischylos' pronounced leaning toward the various forms of art.

1. Following the description in the order of the text we meet Tydeus' shield fringed with bronze bells, while worked upon it was

> φλέγονθ' ὑπ' ἄστροις οὐρανὸν τετυγμένον·
> λαμπρὰ δὲ πανσέληνος ἐν μέσῳ σάκει,
> πρέσβιστον ἄστρον, νυκτὸς ὀφθαλμός, πρέπει[2].

This is much the same scene as Homer described for the decoration on the first of the five folds of Achilles' shield. Here one had the Sun, Moon, the Stars, the Pleiades, Hyades, and the Bear with Orion[3]. In both of these

[1] *Choe.* v. 231 f. [2] *Sept.* vs. 388 ff.
[3] *Il.* 18, vs. 478 ff.

cases the objects are thought of as being represented symbolically. Both the earliest poetry and art of the Greeks fall short of the personified Moon and Stars which are common from the second half of the fifth century B. C. The heavenly bodies were not thought of except in their natural form, and so, if the decoration of either Achilles' or Tydeus' shield had any existence, we may conclude that the actual form of these bodies was painted on or made out of other metal and set on, or represented in a form of relief. The shields on the monuments out of the 'Shaft-graves' at Mykenai really furnish examples of this sort of decoration [1]. There are any number of instances in vase paintings which show a considerable interest in Astronomy. On a vase from Nola appear the heavens with the moon and stars in regular order [2]. A Nolan amphora represents Herakles holding the world, upon which are painted moon and stars [3]. It is interesting to observe further that on shields on vase paintings also the moon sometimes

[1] Cf. Reichel, *Die Homerischen Waffen*, p. 16 f.

[2] Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* iv. pl. 39. 2.

[3] Published in Gerhard's *Akademische Abhandlungen*, atlas pl. 20. 6.

occurs[1], while a star is unusually common as a centre piece on the same[2].

2. Of Kapaneus' shield we learn,

> ἔχει δὲ σῆμα γυμνὸν ἄνδρα πυρφόρον,
> φλέγει δὲ λαμπὰς διὰ χερῶν ὡπλισμένη
> χρυσοῖς δὲ φωνεῖ γράμμασιν "πρήσω πόλιν[3]."

Out of the large number of shield devices appearing on vase paintings I do not know any which represents a human figure except the Panathenaic amphora of the fourth century B. C., where the 'Tyrant Murderers' occur on Athena's shield[4]. This does not prove that the above was not a possible or probable sort of figure. The words appear, however, to have been chosen for the occasion. The allegorical figure

[1] Munich, nos. 476, 545; Millin-Reinach, *Peintures de vases*, ii. pl. 14.

[2] Stars on the bl. fig. vases occupy regularly a secondary position. They are small and ordinarily have few rays, and are in fact as purely decorative as the common zones and belts of red and black with which the shield is often painted. While it is seldom that nothing but the star is painted on the shield of the bl. fig. vase (cf. *Mon. d. Inst.* iii. pl. 24) the simple star becomes from the middle of the fifth century more and more common. The rays increase in number and are more pointed, till in many cases the real brilliant sparkle of the star may be imagined. Cf. Athena's shield, *Compte Rendu* 1865, pl. 6; also *Mon. d. Inst.* xi. pl. 48, and ibid. 1877, pl. 47.

[3] *Sept.* vs. 432 ff.

[4] Brit. Mus. Cat. ii B. 605; published in *Mon. d. Inst.* x. pl. 48 d.

really heightens the effect of the disaster which later overtook Kapaneus. The inscription in 'golden letters' may be thought of as painted on the shield.

3. With Eteokles, however, the notion is quite different. The emblem on his shield is described as follows—

> ἀνὴρ ὁπλίτης κλίμακος προσαμβάσεις
> στείχει πρὸς ἐχθρῶν πύργον, ἐκπέρσαι θέλων[1].

The situation is dramatic and interesting for the period at which Aischylos is writing. Myron himself would not have ventured so far as to attempt this bold situation. It is told, however, of Polygnotos[2] that he had painted such an attack on a city, and that he meant the figure for Kapaneus. Was Aischylos really in debt here to Polygnotos for his idea? This question cannot be answered definitely. It is probable that the great painter first arrived in Athens but a few years before the production of the *Septem* in 467 B.C. Moreover it would seem as though it was just about this time that he began to be popular, and one would rather expect to find his greatest influence in Athens

[1] *Sept.* vs. 466 f.

[2] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 35, 59.

even later than this date[1]. The figure, however, of Kapaneus scaling the Theban walls was a favourite theme for artists[2], and it is not surprising that Aischylos yields to the anachronism for the sake of thus emphasizing his picture.

4. Both the designer of, and the design on, the shield of Hippomedon are praised. Upon this there was

> Τυφῶν' ἱέντα πυρπνόον διὰ στόμα
> λιγυὺν μέλαιναν, αἰόλην πυρὸς κάσιν·
> ὄφεων δὲ πλεκτάναισι περίδρομον κύτος
> προσηδάφισται κοιλογάστορος κύκλου[3].

It is not clear whether one is to understand that the serpents which fringed the shield were a part of the Typhon. This would fit in with the form of the monster which is usually taken as the Typhon. Such a figure is often painted on the vases[4] and passes for Typhoeus, although

[1] Milchhoefer (*Jahrbuch*, 1894, p. 72) places Polygnotos' arrival in Athens shortly after the Persian wars. This would bring the height of his popularity before the Periklean period. Those who place him later in the century are not disposed to set so early a date for his appearance in Athens. Cf. Furtwängler, *Sammlung Sabouroff*, i. Vasen, Einleitung, p. 5 ff.

[2] Cf. *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, 1889, pl. 11, nos. 13, 14, 17.

[3] *Sept.* vs. 493 ff.

[4] Cf. Overbeck, *Kunstmythologie*, i. p. 393 ff.; Heydemann in

there is no inscriptional evidence to that effect. Pausanias tells us that Bathykles made such a figure on the Apollo Throne at Amyklai [1].

The figure of Zeus sitting firmly on the shield of the Theban Hyperbios [2] need not detain us. The lightning bolt which he holds in his hand is a constant attribute of Zeus which appears so characteristically in the earlier vase paintings. The figure could have been easily painted on any shield, for it appears at nearly every turn on the vases.

5. Parthenopaios had perhaps the most characteristic design of any of the heroes.

> *Σφίγγ' ὠμόσιτον προσμεμηχανημένην,*
> *γόμφοις ἐνώμα, λαμπρὸν ἔκκρουστον δέμας,*
> *φέρει δ' ὑφ' αὑτῇ φῶτα Καδμείων ἕνα,*
> *ὡς πλεῖστ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ τῷδ' ἱάπτεσθαι βέλη* [3].

The Sphinx was a goodly part of the stock in trade for the earlier of the Greek artists. As a merely decorative figure it occurs in every conceivable place. It is not surprising, therefore, that a shield had such a design, as the vases [4]

1. *Halle'sches Winckelmannsprogram*, p. 14, names eight bl. fig. vases which represent 'undoubted Typhoeus-pictures.'

[1] 3. 18. 10. [2] vs. 512 ff. [3] vs. 541 ff.

[4] Cf. Gerhard, *Auserl. Vasen.* ii. pl. 95–96, and *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, ser. viii. pl. 7.

and gems[1] show us. There is further the authority of the scholiast Lactantius[2] that the Thebans had such decorations on their shields in historic times. Just this group of a Sphinx and her prey is also preserved on several monuments[3]. Pheidias put it on the Zeus Throne at Olympia[4], so Pausanias tells us. It has been argued that, as the Sphinx was originally an oriental notion, and approached Greece from the east, the Theban form of the Sphinx story was not *the* form of myth which Pheidias had in mind[5]. He was, in other words, under the influence of the rich and profuse oriental decorative motives. This, however, appears to me to combat the natural facts in the case. No one can deny that Aischylos has placed his feet squarely on the Boeotian form of the story, and this is proof adequate that the Athenians of 467 B. C. at least had not laid aside this part of the Sphinx tale. How then can there be any probability that Pheidias, who had passed through his formative years by that time, forgot

[1] No. 117 in Furtwängler's *Beschreibung der geschnittenen Steine im Antiquarium* (Berlin).

[2] On Statius' *Thebais*, 7. 242.

[3] Cf. Overbeck, *Bildwerke*, pl. 1, nos. 5 and 6, and *Vorlegeblätter*, 1889, pl. 9; 8 and 11.

[4] 5. 11. 2.

[5] Milchhoefer, *Athen. Mitth.* 1879, p. 57.

the local significance of the group, and when he was commissioned to do the work at Olympia, used the Sphinx and her human victim because such fantastic notions were popular innovations from the orient?

6. There comes lastly the description of Polyneikes' shield, on which the device was a double one.

> χρυσήλατον γὰρ ἄνδρα τευχηστὴν ἰδεῖν
> ἄγει γυνή τις σωφρόνως ἡγουμένη.
> Δίκη δ' ἄρ' εἶναί φησιν, ὡς τὰ γράμματα
> λέγει "κατάξω δ' ἄνδρα τόνδε καὶ πόλιν
> ἕξει πατρῴων δωμάτων τ' ἐπιστροφάς[1]."

The figure of Justice in female form, conducting the armed warrior back to his city and to his ancestral rights, was a most fitting symbol of Polyneikes' position. Such personifications as Justice, Fear, Sleep, Death are common even in Homer. The early art appears, however, to have held quite as far away from the embodiment of such notions as it did from that of the Moon and Stars. A noted and isolated instance of these elements personified is given on the second zone of the Kypselos chest[2]. Night, in the form of a woman, held in her right hand

[1] vs. 644 ff.

[2] Paus. 5. 18. 1 and 2.

Death, and in her left hand Sleep, both in the form of boys. Immediately following was a well-formed woman who was choking with one hand and beating with the other an ugly female. Pausanias adds that this is the way Dikē does to Adikia. This almost looks as though there had been an inscription for him to read, as he says there was in the case of the three preceding figures. This latter scene occurs exactly as described by Pausanias, on a vase of the severe red figured style, and may be considered one of the earliest extant monuments showing the personification of these abstract notions[1]. This one painting alone shows that Aischylos and his audience really knew of Dikē in art, and that the blazon on Polyneikes' shield is not to be considered a mere fiction of the poet[2].

[1] No. 319 in Masner's *Sammlung antiker Vasen im K. K. Oesterreich. Museum*. Published in Baumeister, *Antike Denk.* iii. p. 1300. In Pindar, *Pyth.* viii. 100 Dikē is personified.

[2] It must be noted with regard to Personification in Greek art, that the Drama evidently gave the great incentive to this conception in the fifth century. While throughout the epic and lyric poetry and the archaic art numerous instances of a person *θάνατος*, *ὕπνος*, *ἔρις*, *φόβος*, and the like are met with, it is plain that first in the middle of the fifth century these and a large class of other elements make their appearance on the Greek vases. When one remembers, therefore, that the tragic writers made use of *βία* and *κράτος* (cf. Aischylos' *Prom.*) and *λύσσα* (cf. Eur. *Her. Fur.*) as characters on the stage, to say nothing of the refinements in the

It will be necessary to revert again to these devices when I come to the discussion of Euripides' handling of the same subject in the *Phoinissai.*

There remains but one object more to claim our attention in the art of Aischylos. He seems to have employed a mongrel creature, part horse and part cock, as a plastic decoration on vessels, whether as prow ornament or as a deck piece it is not clear. Aristophanes takes occasion to quiz the shade of the poet as to what he really meant by his *ἱππαλεκτρυών*[1], but he got no further answer than *σημεῖον ἐν ταῖς ναυσίν*[2]. Such a creature with neck and head of a horse and legs, body, and tail of a cock occurs on black figured vases[3], and the excavations on the

endless number of psychical conditions peculiar to the drama, it is easy to see how it came about that vase painters who based their work on the tragedies should have sought to express the abstract in the form of the concrete. So it is that *τραγῳδία* and *κωμῳδία* appear *cir.* 460 B.C. on the vases (cf. Gerhard, *Auserl. Vasen.* pl. 56, and Millin, *Peinture de vases,* i. 9). Later in the end of the century and on in the succeeding, the number of personified elements increases rapidly. *ἀπάτη, ἄτη, οἶστρος, ἀνάγκη* and many others make their appearance, and owe their existence almost entirely to the influence of the drama.

[1] Cf. frag. 134.

[2] *Ranae,* v. 933.

[3] Munich, no. 86; Berlin, no. 1770, published in Gerhard's *Trinkschalen,* pl. i. 5. 6; no. 335, Athens, published in Roscher's *Lexikon,* i. p. 2663.

Acropolis in 1886 brought to light a substantial fragment of a marble Hippalektryon, which may be dated in the early part of the fifth century, B. C.[1] These traces of the artistic conception of such a fantastic monster are sufficient to throw light on the word used by Aischylos, and furthermore confirm us in our notion that he was the close observer which the preceding discussion has shown him to be[2].

Sophokles, the darling of his age and generation, honoured by state and by individuals, exalted by Aristotle as the perfect poet of tragedy, and ever since admired as the delicate and graceful master of the tragic art, is no less characteristic in the matter and manner of his extant plays than he is in his bearing towards the art in the midst of which he lived. There is hardly any trace in his work that he was conscious of the glorious monuments that were the product of his time. This is all the more remarkable when one considers the warm and appreciative feeling which he manifests towards the beauties of Nature. Witness the famous description of Kolonos, which hardly has its counterpart in

[1] No. 597 in 1891 Cat. Acropolis Mus.

[2] It is instructive to observe Aischylos' familiarity with the legends on coins, cf. *Supp.* v. 282 ff.

Greek literature, unless it be in Euripides' account of the wildness of Kithairon's Bakchai-haunted crags. One naturally inquires whether Sophokles was no admirer of sculpture and painting, or whether he was simply averse to bringing this element into his poetry. One would not suppose that he closed his eyes to the Acropolis blossoming forth with the Parthenon, Propylaia, and Erechtheion. Still the fact is that Pheidias and his school appear to have made little impression upon Sophokles. To be sure, contemporary affairs are very sparingly introduced in his work, and we are not surprised therefore to meet with few hints concerning painting and plastic. Even with this characteristic of Sophokles constantly before us the query is still a puzzling one. Did Sophokles really possess no greater taste for artistic affairs than if he had not passed his days in the time when Pheidias reached the highest perfection in sculpture?

When he makes mention of Sunion[1] it is not to linger at the Athena temple, but to gain from that wave-beaten promontory a glimpse of sacred Athens. He did not, however, fail to leave a record of the great Heraion at Argos[2], which

[1] *Ajax*, v. 1220. [2] *Elekt.* v. 8. Cf. also Paus. 2. 17. 3.

was for him, as for all the Greek world, ὁ κλεινὸς ναός. Another temple which he refers to, and which had a real existence, is that of Apollo at Abai [1]. With this, which is introduced merely on account of its oracular importance, may be classed the various temples of the gods in Thebes [2] which he names more than once. Of these the διπλοῖς ναοῖς [3] seems to deserve more than a passing notice. It is clear that διπλοῦς may mean 'two,' and in this case one may accept the explanation of the scholiast, followed by Jebb [4], who suggests two of the several Athena temples known to have existed in Thebes. On the other hand, the first meaning of διπλοῦς is 'double,' and we ought first to consider the simpler and more common sense of the word before passing to the derived meaning. The much discussed διπλοῦν οἴκημα of Pausanias [5] suggests itself at once. This phrase by which the periegete designated the Erechtheion may refer to the whole building, and in that case would have reference to the Athena and Poseidon-Erechtheus parts of the οἴκημα, or it may be confined to the part with which Pausanias

[1] *Oed. Rex*, v. 899. Cf. Paus. 10. 35. 1–3, and Herod. 8. 33.
[2] *Ant.* vs. 152, 286; *Oed. Rex*, vs. 20, 912.
[3] *Oed. Rex*, v. 20.
[4] *Oedipus Tyrannus*, p. 13 f.
[5] 1. 25. 6.

was engaged, i.e. the Poseidon-Erechtheus section. The latter, it appears to me, is the correct understanding of the words as used in the text. Pausanias is actually inside of the temple and has described the paintings on the *walls*. This demands more than one wall, which so far as we are able to judge was all that the western chamber of the Erechtheion had. The doors on the north and south sides occupied practically all the space, and the partition between the west room and the middle one was, so far as the investigation shows, a row of pillars. To get *walls* therefore Pausanias must have been in the west cella of the temple. His *διπλοῦν οἴκημα* which follows directly at this point can have no reference to the whole building therefore, but simply to the room in which he found himself. This cella was, then, the double room [1]. The dividing wall probably ran east and west [2]. So much for the Pausaniac use of *διπλοῦς* as

[1] That Pausanias uses *οἴκημα* to denote one room, and therefore a part of a building, is proved by 1. 22. 6, where he speaks of the Pinakotheke *ἔστι δὲ ἐν ἀριστερᾷ τῶν προπυλαίων οἴκημα ἔχον γραφάς*. This, it appears to me, invalidates the argument for the exclusive meaning of 'house,' 'dwelling,' which Miss Harrison maintains is the only sense of the word. Cf. *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, p. 492.

[2] Cf. Furtwängler, *Masterpieces*, p. 436, for other arguments leading to the same result.

applied to the Erechtheion. It has already been said that the adjective might well characterize the double nature of the whole building, and this had actually been the meaning of the word had Pausanias employed the term in the proper connexion. This double form of structure was particularly well carried out in the Erechtheion, with its two or even more cults and the dividing wall between the east and west cella. Such was true also in the case of the 'Old Temple' of Athena. This was first sufficiently emphasized by Professor Furtwängler[1]. The purpose of all this discussion has been to show that Sophokles in using the adjective διπλοῦς most likely intended his audience to understand in fact double temples—two cults and two cellas—such as the 'Old Temple' of the Acropolis was. The date of the *Oedipus Rex* is so uncertain that it will not do to contend that the poet meant likewise the Erechtheion. The latter, which was probably begun after the Peace of Nikias[2], could hardly have served him in this passage. At any rate I prefer to look upon the words of Sophokles as pointing directly to the temples on the Acro-

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 416.

[2] Cf. Furtwängler, *op. cit.* p. 432, and Michaelis in *Athen. Mitth.* xiv. p. 363.

polis, with which the Athenians were well acquainted.

The most important passage referring to sculpture and the fine arts in general, which may possibly be brought under Sophokles' name, is out of a fragment from an unknown play [1].

> Θνητοὶ δὲ πολλοὶ καρδίᾳ πλανώμενοι
> ἱδρυσάμεσθα πημάτων παραψυχὴν
> θεῶν ἀγάλματ' ἐκ λίθων ἢ χαλκέων
> ἢ χρυσοτεύκτων ἢ ἐλεφαντίνων τύπους.

The poet runs the scale here of the four materials used for statuary: marble, bronze, gold, ivory. Out of such are the images made which the heartsick mortals dedicate to the gods. Notwithstanding the apparent richness of the artistic in these words, they have merely a religious air. The poet wrote them in no glow of soul for the chryselephantine statue of Athena in the Parthenon, but solely for the ethical purport which they bear. Through them appears the teacher, the guardian of the public morals.

[1] Nauck, *Fragmenta*, no. 1025, but classed under the *dubia et spuria*. Although there is adequate testimony to establish the Sophoklean origin of the fragment if mere names are taken into consideration, the tone of the whole is thoroughly foreign to what one expects from Sophokles.

Further than this Sophokles has nothing to say of any monuments, save cultus-statues, which have their place as of sacred meaning[1]. It will appear therefore from what has been said that he occupies a unique position between Aischylos and Euripides. This practically absolute silence with regard to works of art is a true index of the Sophoklean style, and furnishes a sure guide to the student for determining upon the non-Sophoklean style of the *Rhesos*[2].

This brings me now to the real subject of the present investigation—the artistic elements in Euripides' work. It is not impossible to point out that this poet occupies a position quite alone among ancient Greek authors. Whether Euripides' love of rhetoric and fine language, his conscious and often studied elaboration of a situation, account for his extraordinary interest in all branches of art, may for the present purpose be left to one side. Whether he was in very fact a *connoisseur* or a mere *dilettante*, who loved to make an appearance of being artistic, is all one and the same thing as far as we are at present concerned. The simple fact is that in

[1] *Oed. Rex*, vs. 885, 1379, and *Elekt.* v. 1374; *Trach.* v. 768 and fr. 433, 4, furnish the only references to a craftsman or his work.

[2] Vid. below, p. 112 ff.

no poet of antiquity does one get so close to the artistic life of the ancient Greeks. Euripides comes nearer to giving a commentary on the artistic activity of his time than any author of the classical period. True, that more of his plays are preserved than of the other two tragic writers combined, and we have accordingly a much better opportunity for following up any such question. There are, however, but two or three of the whole number of his tragedies which do not yield instances where the poet describes or refers to important monuments. Throughout nearly all of the plays which have reached us, one may detect a certain tone that is evidently pitched to harmonize with the spirit of the Parthenon Frieze. The poet mirrors in no uncertain manner the artistic life that flourished about the Acropolis. His verses run over with descriptions of, or allusions to, figures and groups which can be traced in the fifth century B.C. plastic and painting.

In order to give the matter as clear an exposition as possible, I shall follow much the same order as in the case of Aischylos and divide the subject into—1. Architecture; 2. Plastic; 3. Painting; 4. Weaving and Embroidery; 5. Miscellany.

1. The beauty of a Greek temple evidently appealed deeply to our poet. He is acquainted with even the details of the building. His gods are, moreover, housed in edifices which had a real existence and which are historical facts. It is enough for Aischylos and Sophokles generally if their divinities have a temple in an indefinite nowhere. The spirit and not the letter is paramount with them. Euripides, on the other hand, was equally much interested in the letter, and wherever it was possible he introduced a building that concerned men as well as gods. It is the product of the Greek genius which appealed to him—the splendid structures that reminded his audience of work they had seen or helped to do. He manifests a real delight in parading his knowledge of the members in a temple. *τρίγλυφος*[1], *στῦλος*[2], *παραστάς*[3], *θριγκός*[4], *γεῖσα*[5], all trip lightly into his meter. All this would not be in itself remarkable, or worthy of mention, if it were not so thoroughly Euripidean. We have seen that neither of his two great compeers concerned

[1] *Bak.* v. 1214; *Orest.* v. 1372; *Iph. T.* v. 113.
[2] *Iph. T.* vs. 50, 128; fr. 203.
[3] *Andr.* v. 1121; *Iph. T.* 1159; *Phoin.* v. 415.
[4] *Elekt.* v. 1151; *Orest.* v. 1569; *Iph. T.* vs. 47, 73; *Ion,* v. 156.
[5] *Orest.* vs. 1570, 1620.

themselves about the details of architecture. One may look in vain to find in their plays any reference to the triglyph, the geison, or the parastas. They do not know the scientific vocabulary of Euripides. They are, in brief, not so much occupied with the everyday and transient. The poet, however, who did not hesitate to remove the scene of Orestes' and Elektra's meeting from the splendour of the Argive palace to a mean farmer's hut, had a sympathetic interest in marbled colonnades and temples, which distinguishes him above all other Greek authors of his time. If the erection of buildings smacked too much of the ordinary mechanic's calling—if it was too near *βαναυσία* to be worthy the concern of Sophokles, we are glad that for Euripides *nihil humani alienum erat*[1].

At one wide stroke the poet sweeps before us the unparalleled panorama of Athens' porticos and marbled halls:—

> *οὐκ ἐν ταῖς ζαθέαις Ἀθά-*
> *ναις εὐκίονες ἦσαν αὐ-*
> *λαὶ θεῶν μόνον*[2].

[1] This dabbling in everyday affairs is what gets Euripides the censure of Aristophanes. The latter's words in the *Ranae*, v. 959 ff. suggest just what I am engaged in pointing out as peculiarly a virtue.

[2] *Ion*, vs. 184 ff.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

'One finds not in god-fearing Athens alone fine columned halls for the gods.' The chorus say this in order to start the song on the richness of the Apollo temple at Delphi. It will be observed that Euripides considered the buildings of his native city the standard. The shapely structures could only be copied, not outdone. At this time Athens stood alone in her solitary greatness. Pheidias and Iktinos had done their work. Further on in the same play we meet the three daughters of Agraulos dancing on the green lawn to the music of Pan's pipes before the temples of Pallas:—

> ὦ Πανὸς θακήματα καὶ
> παραυλίζουσα πέτρα
> μυχώδεσι Μακραῖς,
> ἵνα χοροὺς στείβουσι ποδοῖν
> Ἀγραύλου κόραι τρίγονοι
> στάδια χλοερὰ πρὸ Παλλάδος
> ναῶν, συρίγγων
> ὑπ' αἰόλας ἰαχᾶς
> ὕμνων[1] . . .

Pan's Grotto, which is brought in here, and the 'Long Rocks' are well established in the topography of Athens, or rather of the Citadel.

[1] *Ion*, vs. 492 ff.

Mention of them brings us at once to the northwest slope of the Acropolis[1]. The poet is particular and definite in what he has the chorus recall of their home city. But where in this locality on the north slope were there any temples of Pallas? So far as we know, there never was any shrine of Athena in this neighbourhood. The poet, moreover, did not have a too critical audience, and so when he was in need of temples at this juncture, those above on the Acropolis served his purpose. The unusual strain on *πρό* was easily overlooked, and in a moment the public who listened to the play was transferred to the broad expanse on the great rock above them, where they saw the idyllic situation. There was the magnificent background of the Parthenon and the 'Old Temple' of Athena, before which sports the happy train of Attic maidens. To be sure, it is not just clear how Pan got wind enough into his syrinx to make himself heard from his distant Grotto. One is naturally interested in looking more closely at

[1] The excavations of the Greek Archaeological Society have laid this slope partly bare within the last year and have brought a great deal to light concerning the topography of this locality. Cf. Kavvadias' report in the *Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική*, 1897, and a *résumé* of the same in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, Sept. 11, 1897, p. 1147 ff.; *ibid.* for Sept. 25 and Oct. 2.

Παλλάδος ναοί. Does the plural of the noun have any particular significance? It seems more than likely that *ναῶν* has no further force here than *ναοῦ* would have. The instances where the plural is put where only the singular could possibly have been meant are enough in Euripides[1] alone to render any conjecture based upon the literal sense of *ναῶν* quite worthless. Here, however, where we are certain that a plurality of temples did exist, it may be quite possible that the literal meaning is the correct one. Unfortunately we are not informed as to the date of the *Ion*. The general consensus of opinion regarding its appearance is that it must be placed later than 421 B.C.[2] This brings us exactly in the period when the Peace of Nikias rendered the Athenians free to build the new Erechtheion, and it is to this time that the commencement of this last monumental temple on the Acropolis is usually assigned. The official name of this new building was 'the temple in which is the sacred image[3],' in other words, practically a new Athena temple again. Although

[1] Cf. especially *Iph. T.* v. 1215.

[2] So Christ, *Griech. Literaturgeschichte*, p. 228. Haigh, *Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, sets it subsequent to the Sicilian expedition. Others come down as late as 412 B.C.

[3] *C. I. A.* i. 322.

the roof was still wanting in 409–8 B.C.[1], the composition of the *Ion* does not exclude the possibility that Euripides had in mind the new and glorious shrine of the sacred image[2].

Another instance of this concern in Athenian temples is met with in the *Hippolytos*. Aphrodite speaks the prologue and states that before Phaidra came to Troizene, the scene of the play, she had built a temple to Aphrodite:—

> πέτραν παρ' αὐτὴν Παλλάδος κατόψιον
> γῆς τῆσδε ναὸν **Κυπρίδος** ἐγκαθείσατο
> ἐρῶσ' ἔρωτ' ἔκδημον· Ἱππολύτῳ δ' ἔπι
> τὸ λοιπὸν ὠνόμαζεν ἱδρῦσθαι θεάν[3].

This means on the side of the Acropolis facing Troizene, i.e. on the south-west slope, where Pausanias[4] actually saw statues of Aphrodite Pandemos and a monument of Hippolytos. Out of this comes the fact that there was a sanctuary of the goddess here and a temple which the periegete forgot to mention, but of which Euripides has

[1] Chandler inscription Brit. Mus. Vid. Newton's *Inscriptions of the British Museum*, i. xxxv.

[2] Dörpfeld denies that the temple was ever really called under the name given in the inscription, on the ground that the image always remained in the 'Old Temple.' Cf. his summing up of all the important theories and the restatement of his own position in *Athen. Mitth.* 1897, p. 159 ff.

[3] vs. 30 ff.

[4] 1 22. 2.

made use. The name of it again, ἐφ' Ἱππολύτῳ, has been actually discovered for us in an inscription[1]. Pausanias then has really left no more important contribution on the monuments of this place than Euripides has done in his casual reference. It matters little that the last two verses quoted above are spurious[2]. While the ναὸν Κυπρίδος (v. 29) is genuine the title under which it was known is of secondary importance.

In Sparta our poet was acquainted with the temple of Athena Chalkioikos[3], which, according to Pausanias, was situated on the Acropolis and dated from the time of Tyndareus. It was completed many years later by the Lakedaimonians, who put in the bronze statue of the goddess. The latter was the work of Gitiades[4].

The temple of the Taurian Artemis is particularly well described. The cella where the image was kept had a marble floor[5]. The columns are spoken of as shapely[6], the coping is gilded[7], the style is a Doric peripteral[8]. As Pylades suggests

[1] Harrison, *Mythology and Monuments of Athens*, p. 333.

[2] Wilamowitz aptly remarks that Phaidra, who all the time conceals her love for Hippolytos, could not have given this name to the temple. Vid. *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 188.

[3] *Hel.* v. 1466 f. Cf. also vs. 228, 245; *Troad.* v. 1113.

[4] Paus. 3. 17. 2. [5] *Iph. T.* v. 997. [6] v. 128.

[7] v. 129. [8] v. 405.

that one of them can enter through the triglyph to steal the image[1], we learn of an early temple where there were not only no sculptured metopes, but not even a smooth slab to close up the opening between the triglyphs. He does not forget to mention the pilasters at the entrance[2]. The palace of Agamemnon exhibits the same feature of open metopes, for Euripides arranges the escape of the slave by this passage[3]. It is a well-known fact that through these verses the earliest stage of the Doric entablature can be traced. When Agave will impale the head of Pentheus upon the triglyph[4], the second stage, where timber was used for closing the metope, can be seen.

The Apollo temple at Delphi is described in a splendid manner. Euripides takes occasion to repeatedly emphasize his interest in the rich architectural display at Delphi. The well-known passage in the *Andromache*, where the messenger reports to Peleus and the chorus that on the arrival of Neoptolemos in Delphi they had spent three days in seeing the sights,

> τρεῖς μὲν φαεννὰς ἡλίου διεξόδους
> θέᾳ διδόντες ὄμματ' ἐξεπίμπλαμεν[5].

[1] v. 113. [2] v. 1159. [3] *Orest.* vs. 1369 ff.
[4] *Bak.* vs. 1212 ff. [5] vs. 1086 f.

speaks for the splendor of the place and for the works of art which Euripides himself had no doubt seen. It appears to me highly probable that in the oft-recurring allusions to details of Delphi's shrines the poet speaks from personal knowledge. The chorus of Athenian women as they went along the street towards the Apollo temple cast their eyes up to the pedimental sculpture just as one may suppose them to have done on approaching the entrance of the Parthenon. They beheld the west gable first and passed on along the side to the east end where, before going near to the entrance, they halted again and took in the pediment groups above them. This is all apparent from the *διδύμων τε προσώπων καλλίφαρον φῶς*[1], which can have reference to nothing else than the two gables. The subject of the scenes is, much to our regret, left entirely for the reader to supply. Easy as it would have been for Euripides to drop a hint as to what was represented in the sculptural decorations of the great temple, he diverts the chorus at once to other parts of the building. In another place, however, we learn that in one gable were Apollo, Artemis, and the Muses, and in the other,

[1] *Ion*, vs. 188 f. *καλλιβλέφαρον*, *em.* Brodraeus, meets the demands of the meter and is an improvement over *καλλίφαρον*.

doubtless the west, was the setting sun, with Dionysios and his troop of Thyiades[1]. This is the only time in all of Pausanias' account of the sights at Delphi when he furnishes us the least information concerning the sculptural work on the temple. For all else one has to be content with the poetical version in the present chorus, which runs off directly into what has been called a 'neck-breaking archaeological exegesis'[2]. The chorus breaks up into semi-chori, and admires with mutual interest the sculptured metopes[3].

Semi-chorus.—*ἰδοὺ τάνδ' ἄθρησον·*
Λερναῖον ὕδραν ἐναίρει
χρυσέαις ἅρπαις ὁ Διὸς παῖς·
Semi-chorus.—*ὁρῶ. καὶ πέλας ἄλλος αὐ-*
τοῦ πανὸν πυρίφλεκτον αἴ-
ρει τις[4] . . . . . .

[1] Paus. 10. 19. 4. He mentions further the two sculptors, Praxias, a pupil of Kalamis, and Androsthenes, adding that they were both Athenians. Cf. Welcker, *Alte Denkmäler*, i. pp. 150–178, for a discussion of the sculptures on the Delphi Apollo temple.

[2] Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen*, p. 35, note 12.

[3] That the metopes are really meant has been generally accepted since the time of K. O. Müller and Welcker. That paintings or tapestry, inside decorations, are not to be thought of here seems clear from the fact that the chorus is still outside. They first inquire about entering in v. 220. Robert, *Iliupersis des Polygnot*, 1893, p. 36, note 23, thinks the Herakles and Bellerophon groups were akroteria, while the others only were metopes.

[4] vs. 190 ff.

Herakles killing the Lernaian Hydra is among the earliest labours on the black figured vases. Only exceptionally does his reliable second, Iolaos, fail him. The moment described here, where the monster is being actually decapitated, is traceable from the archaic Greek art down to Roman times. The same occurred on one of the twelve metopes of the Zeus temple at Olympia[1] and on a metope of the 'so-called Theseion' in Athens. The golden sickle with which Herakles does his good work in the present instance must be thought of as in fact a metal instrument.

The next metope described represented Bellerophon assailing the Chimaira:—

> Καὶ μὰν τόνδ' ἄθρησον
> πτεροῦντος ἕφεδρον ἵππου·
> τὰν πῦρ πνέουσαν ἐναίρει
> τρισώματον ἀλκάν.

Euripides would appear to have assigned a prominent place to this god of the Sikyonians. He devoted a whole tragedy to him[2] and had him play again an important rôle in the *Stheneboia*.

[1] Here, however, Iolaos was wanting.

[2] For the fragments of *Bellerophon* vid. Nauck, *op. cit.* 285–312.

The Chimaira alone is brought on to Achilles' armor in another place[1]. The group appears repeatedly on vases, gems, and reliefs. It was worked in relief on the Amyklaian Throne[2] and on the base of the Asklepios colossus at Epidauros[3]. The Melan plaque[4] in the British Museum, which dates from the early part of the fifth century B.C., is the oldest extant monument representing the fight. The legend, which was peculiarly Lykian, could not be wanting in Asia Minor monuments, and was not, as the Gjölbaschi relief[5] and another, of which there is a cast in the British Museum[6], assure us. It should be noted in passing that the composition of such a group lent itself remarkably well to the limitations of a metope sculpture, and here, no less than in all the figures which the chorus describes, we are reminded strongly of the plausibility of bringing these scenes into the narrow field between the triglyphs.

Next comes an extended scene. The chorus refers in a general way to a long stretch of the

[1] *Elekt.* vs. 473 ff.
[2] Paus. 3. 18. 13.
[3] Paus. 2. 27. 2.
[4] Published in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, i. p. 301.
[5] Cf. Benndorf, *Das Heroon von Gjölbaschi*, pl. 22.
[6] No. 760 *Cat. of Greek Sculpture.* Cf. Benndorf, *op. cit.* p. 61.

metopes, where the Gigantomachia was acted in great fury:—

> σκέψαι κλόνον ἐν τείχε-
> σι λαΐνοισι Γιγάντων

to which the second group replies

> ὧδε δερκόμεθ', ὦ φίλαι.

At this point, then, it appears that each metope is taken in detail. The description can be broken up so that out of what appears like a possible frieze there come three excellent groups such as would fit well into a quadrangular space.

1. Semi-chorus.—
   λεύσσεις οὖν ἐπ' Ἐγκελάδῳ
   γοργωπὸν πάλλουσαν ἴτυν;
2. Semi-chorus.—
   λεύσσω Παλλάδ', ἐμὰν θεόν.

} 1st metope.

1. Semi-chorus.—
   τί γάρ; κεραυνὸν
   ἀμφίπυρον ὄβριμον ἐν Διὸς
   ἑκηβόλοισι χερσίν;
2. Semi-chorus.—
   ὁρῶ, τὸν δαΐον
   Μίμαντα πυρὶ καταιθαλοῖ.

} 2nd metope.

1. Semi-chorus.—
   καὶ Βρόμιος ἄλλον ἀπολέμοισι
   κισσίνοισι βάκτροις
   ἐναίρει Γᾶς τέκνων ὁ Βακχεύς.

} 3rd metope.

Zeus and Athena, who occupy our attention here first, always bear the brunt of the battle. The unbounded popularity of the big conflict is attested by the almost countless vase paintings which preserve the scene. In many cases, too, the inscriptions added to the Olympian combatants enlist more interest in the progress of the affair. The well-known painting[1], which represents Athena charging with terrible fury on the all but vanquished Enkelados, is the best possible illustration of the composition which one would expect the first metope to have shown. It is exactly in the manner of a metope[2]. The one unfailing weapon of Zeus is invariably the thunderbolt, as in the present case. A fine red figured vase, found in Altamura[3], is decorated with the Gigantomachia, and shows us the same order of the gods which the chorus follows. Dionysios holds, however, a vine in his left hand and plunges a torch into the giant with the other. That Bromios actually engages the giants with his 'unwarlike thyrsoi' may be seen on other

[1] Published in Gerhard's *Auserl. Vasen.* pl. 6; Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, i. fig. 173.

[2] This seems to be the same group which occurs in the Selinus metope. Cf. Benndorf, *Metopen von Selinus*, pl. 10.

[3] Heydemann, 6. *Halle'sches Winckelmannsprogram*, pl. 1.

vases[1]. The gable group of the Treasure House of the Megarians at Olympia[2] and the frieze on the Treasure House of the Siphnians at Delphi[3] are the earliest extant monuments representing the battle in stone. The same was also on the metopes of the Heraion at Argos[4]. By far the most important sculptural Gigantomachia for the Athenians must have been that on the east metopes of their own Parthenon[5]. These latter were daily before the eyes of the people, and the public which listened to the account of the distant temple at Delphi was doubtless much interested to learn the points common to Athena's Parthenon and Apollo's famous shrine.

It must be observed in this connexion that not a trace of the temple sculpture has been discovered during the last five years of the French excavations at Delphi. The immense pedimental pieces and the metopes and frieze

[1] Cf. no. 1274 Hermitage.

[2] Vid. *Ausgrabungen von Olympia*, text iii. p. 5 ff.

[3] *B. C. H.* 1895, p. 535, and Furtwängler in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1894, p. 1275. This building, which was, according to Herodotus, begun 524 B.C., was probably completed in a short time thereafter, and if the frieze was put on at this time one may arrive at a tolerably close date for another important work of Greek sculpture which modern excavations have brought to light.

[4] Paus. 2. 17. 3.

[5] Michaelis, *Parthenon*, atlas pl. 5.

have vanished as completely as though removed by man's hand. This complete and utter annihilation of the monumental works can not be due to any work of nature, and so one looks about to detect where in history the temple was thus robbed of its marbles. It has been suggested that Constantine may be charged with this vandalism [1]. His new capital on the Bosporus is well known to have been adorned with many a costly and splendid votive offering from Delphi and other places, and it is not likely that he would have hesitated at pulling the heathen temple asunder if out of the pile he could enrich the city of Constantine. Of course it is mere conjecture that lays this at the door of the great emperor. As Pausanias, however, saw the gable groups, or at least describes them, as still in existence in his time, the despoliation must be set after the time of the Antonines. Conscious, therefore, of the hopeless outlook for ever getting more definite information concerning the sculpture, one has to make the most out of what Euripides has given. He may or may not be relating real facts; perhaps the whole is idle invention. We cannot at any rate prove that

[1] Homolle, *B. C. H.* 1894, p. 175. Cf. also Pomtow in *Arch. Anz.* 1894, p. 3 ff. (*Jahrbuch*, 1895).

we do not possess in this chorus the most extensive description of the Apollo temple sculptures. For my part I prefer to see a large parcel of truth in the poet's words.

Further comment on the metopes is broken off suddenly by the appearance of Ion at the entrance. In the *Andromache*[1], however, one is taken inside and given a glimpse of the interior. A laurel tree, large enough to conceal behind it the band of Delphians, grows by the altar. Neoptolemos, when set upon by them, jumps from the altar to the portals of the door (*παραστάς*)[2] and takes down from pegs a shield and sword from among the votive offerings which were hanging there. He hurries back and springs upon the altar to better defend himself. Later the fight is waged up and down the aisles on either side of the cella, *στενόποροι ἔξοδοι*. Amidst it all the very stones in the walls echoed from the unholy tumult. It should be remembered further that Ion can hardly talk of much

[1] vs. 1111 ff. The scene is beautifully illustrated on an amphora published in *Annali d' Inst.* 1868, tav. d' Agg. E.

[2] That articles were hung on the *παραστάδες* requires that nails or pegs were driven in the wall. This means that this part of the temple was of wood. So in the Parthenon it has been observed that wood was employed for the door-casings, while in the Erechtheion the stone casings can be still seen. Cf. Dörpfeld in *Athen. Mitth.* 1887, p. 196 ff.

else in the first lyric passage than the temple and the votive offerings and vessels [1].

Under the term σηκός Euripides refers to the Demeter-Korē temple at Eleusis [2] and the Athena temple at Troy [3]. In the *Kyklopes* [4] the giant is reminded by Odysseus of Poseidon's temples on Tainaron, and at Cape Malea and Geraistos, along with Sunion and its Doric pile. He knew likewise the temple of Artemis at Aulis [5], and lofty temples at Argos wherein the Greeks had hung their trophies brought from Troy [6]. Likewise there was a Thetideion in Thessaly, a 'splendid habitation [7].' Through Athena he orders Orestes to build a temple at Halai for the Taurian xoanon [8].

An instructive fragment from the *Hypsipyle* [9] affords a glimpse at pedimental sculpture in colors:—

ἰδού, πρὸς αἰθέρ' ἐξαμίλλησαι κόρας
γραπτούς ⟨τ' ἐν αἰετ⟩οῖσι πρόσβλεψον τύπους.

'Look, direct your eyes heavenward, gazing on the painted statues [10] in the gables.' This

[1] *Ion*, vs. 97, 104, 107, 111, 115, 121, 140, 157, 177, 178.
[2] *Supp.* v. 30. [3] *Rhesos*, v. 501. Cf. also *Hek.* v. 1008.
[4] vs. 290 ff. [5] *Iph. A.* v. 1432. [6] *Elekt.* v. 7.
[7] *Andr.* v. 20. [8] *Iph. T.* v. 1453. [9] Nauck, *Fragmenta*, 764.
[10] τύποι really means 'reliefs,' but in this case it seems clear that sculpture in the round is meant.

notion of painted marbles may be well understood from the numerous female statues in the Acropolis Museum. Especially striking are the poros stone gable figures, probably from one of the older temples of the Acropolis. The famous 'Blue Beard[1]' is well calculated to be a good commentary on this *unicum* in Greek literature.

The work of the Kyklops which Aischylos did not recognize and which gets only a bare notice from Sophokles[2], was not without its interest for Euripides. Their walls were for him marvelous products of ingenuity. Argos and Mykenai are inseparably associated with the work of the great builders[3]. The huge masonry of this people so overshadowed the Argive plain that this is often called the land of the Kyklops[4].

2. *Plastic.*

Statuary does not receive so much attention from Euripides as do some other branches of art. Actual historic monuments are seldom referred to, and yet there is abundant material

[1] Published in *Antike Denkmäler*, i. pl. 30; Collignon, *Histoire de la Sculpture Grecque*, ii. p. 208.

[2] fr. 207 in Nauck.

[3] *Elekt.* v. 1158; *Her. Fur.* v. 944 ff.; *Iph. A.* vs. 152, 534, 1501, frag. 269.

[4] *Her. Fur.* v. 15; *Orest.* v. 965; *Troades*, v. 1088; *Iph. T.* v. 845; *Iph. A.* v. 265.

which argues for a wide and sympathetic understanding of what sculpture meant in the life of the people.

As much of the discussion centres about ἄγαλμα, it is necessary to bear in mind the uses of the word as pointed out above[1]. The word in Euripides has a new life in it which is not met with before. There is in its use often something that speaks to us of a warmth and beauty born only from genuinely exquisite feeling.

Of the historical works which may with certainty be traced under the cloak of the verse the Athena Parthenos must first of all be considered. The splendour of the Pheidian creation shed a lustre over all Euripides' Athenas[2]. She is 'Pallas of the golden shield[3],' and 'of the golden spear[4],' and the Gorgon which she wears is gold[5]. The *locus classicus*[6] on the latter is characterized by a wealth of detail which bespeaks a conviction born of art. The story about the origin of the aigis would have been interesting at any time, but the fresh handling given by

[1] p. 6 f.

[2] A suggestion of the chryselephantine work appears in *Phoin.* v. 220.

[3] *Phoin.* v. 1372.

[4] *Ion*, v. 9.

[5] fr. 351.

[6] *Ion*, v. 989 ff.

Pheidias to the 'snake-entwined Gorgon's skin which Athena wore over her bosom, and which the people called the aigis,' was not without its influence on our poet. The latter has evidently catered to the public curiosity and delivered here a neat account of the garment which had, under Pheidias' hand, been given a final and definite form[1]. It is just this which is particularly emphasized in the *Ion*[2].

In the *Elektra*[3], when the Dioskouroi appear in order to settle the critical situation of affairs, they order Orestes—

> ἐλθὼν δ' Ἀθήνας Παλλάδος σεμνὸν βρέτας
> πρόσπτυξον· εἴρξει γάρ νιν ἐπτοημένας
> δεινοῖς δράκουσιν, ὥστε μὴ ψαύειν σέθεν,
> γοργῶφ' ὑπερτείνουσά σου κάρᾳ κύκλον.

Euripides pictures the goddess extending her aigis in order to protect Orestes from the attack of the Furies. We have seen above[4] that there is reason for believing the *σεμνὸν βρέτας*, i.e. the sacred xoanon, a sitting Athena. Here, on the contrary, there is no question but that a standing figure is meant. This shows us that while Euripides had to employ the language that

[1] Cf. Furtwängler, *op. cit.* p. 11.
[2] vs. 1015, 1055, 1421, 1478.
[3] vs. 1254 ff.
[4] p. 7 ff.

applied to the old image, he had in mind the other type of Athena and not unlikely the statue of the Parthenon. The goddess holds out her aigis regularly, as a shield, in the battle with the giants[1]. On one vase from Lower Italy the scene which is described above really occurs, the difference being only that the scene is laid at Delphi, and not at Athens. Orestes is on the altar beside Apollo and the laurel tree, and the goddess stretches out her left arm with the aigis and shields the suppliant from the Furies, who appear ready for the attack[2].

The image which furnished Euripides the kernel for the *Iphigeneia in Tauris* was evidently in existence at Brauron in the poet's time[3]. This appears to me to have been settled by Robert[4]. The exalted importance of this cult was brought about very largely no doubt through the working of the drama. Athena herself prophesies the outcome of the whole matter as

[1] In marble the noted example is that published by Clarac III, no. 848. On vases cf. especially the beautiful Erginos-Aristophanes kylix, Berlin, no. 2531, published by Gerhard, *Trinkschalen und Gefässe*, pl. 2, 3; *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, ser. i. pl. 5.

[2] Published in *Arch. Ztg.* 1860, pl. 137, 4, and in Overbeck, *Bildwerke*, 29, 8.

[3] Pausanias, 1. 23. 7, and 1. 33. 1, with which cf. Robert, *Archaeologische Märchen*, p. 144 ff.

[4] *loc. cit.*

Orestes is about to get away with the idol and his sister. He is to take the two and proceed to Attica. At Halai, a sacred spot, he shall erect a temple and place in it the image. Iphigeneia shall serve as priestess to the goddess where mount the sacred stairs at Brauron, and when she dies she is to be buried there, and 'for a monument shall be brought the well-spun garments of the women who died in childbirth.' The image is called both ξεστὸν ἄγαλμα[1] and σεμνὸν βρέτας[2], but nothing further is learned from Euripides. When Pausanias visited the temple of Artemis Brauronia on the Acropolis he made mention of only one statue, and that, the work of Praxiteles[3]. Through inscriptions[4], however, another image is known to have been in the temple, and this was unquestionably a copy of the original image at Brauron. The inscriptions which cover the years 367/6 to 334/3 B.C. name distinctly two statues[5].

1. τὸ ἕδος, τὸ ἕδος τὸ ἀρχαῖον or τὸ ἕδος τὸ λίθινον.
2. τὸ ἄγαλμα, τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ ὀρθόν or ἄγαλμα τὸ ἑστηκός.

[1] vs. 111 f.
[2] v. 1291.
[3] 1. 23. 7.
[4] *C. I. A.* ii. 751–765.
[5] Vid. Robert, *op. cit.* p. 155, and the same in Harrison, *Mythology and Monuments of Athens*, p. 400.

It seems clear from this that No. 1 stands for the old image, a copy, as I think, of the Brauron one, and the same which Euripides has in mind, while No. 2 was the temple statue proper by Praxiteles. No. 1 is distinguished by implication as a sitting statue. While, too, the material is marble, we cannot be sure that the Brauron image was of the same material. This, then, is as near as we may come to the character of the xoanon which plays the big rôle in the *Iphigeneia in Tauris*. We come now to what appears to be a very important fact. Euripides states through the mouth of Athena that Iphigeneia shall have laid upon her tomb at Brauron πέπλων εὐπήνους ὑφάς[1] which have belonged to women dying in childbirth. Now, curiously enough, the inscriptions referred to above are mere inventories of articles dedicated to Artemis by Athenian women; not only dresses of all sorts, but jewellery, girdles, &c. These were actually put on the statues, περὶ τῷ ἕδει and περὶ τῷ ἀγάλματι, as the inscriptions read. The poet has probably inserted these words concerning this in order to give a long established custom a distinguished and praiseworthy origin. The words of the fourth century B.C. inscription read in very fact like

[1] v. 1465.

a detailed account of the custom which is first mentioned by Euripides. We are enabled to restore for ourselves much of the picture which no doubt often met his eyes on entering the temple of Artemis Brauronia on the Acropolis, under the influence of which he must have been in writing the prophecy of Athena.

Daidalos was for Euripides as well as for Plato the ideal sculptor of the olden time. He was a definite part of the past when art became native in Greece. He stood for the beginning of the great things which followed. Hekabe wills that 'her arms, her hands, the hairs of her head, also her feet, might be endowed with the power of speech, be it through the skill of Daidalos or some one of the gods[1].' The scholiast on the passage goes on to tell that Euripides himself says Daidalos made statues that moved and spoke. The following are the verses from the *Eurystheus*[2]:—

> οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦ γεραιέ, μὴ δείσῃς τάδε·
> τὰ Δαιδάλεια πάντα κινεῖσθαι δοκεῖ
> λέγειν τ' ἀγάλμαθ'· ὧδ' ἀνὴρ κεῖνος σοφός.

For Euripides, therefore, the first name in the history of Greek art represented a real person-

[1] *Hek.* vs. 836 ff.

[2] fr. 372.

ality. He was once a living genius, who made sculpture for the first time national among the Hellenes. Daidalos and the Daidalidai were no more a myth to him than were Homer and the Homeridai [1]. It is worth while to note in passing that Aischylos does not mention Daidalos. The half-dozen fragments of Sophokles' play under this name do not allow us to form any notion as to what the nature of the tragedy was. In the extant work of this poet no further mention is made of Daidalos. Pindar, however, knew of him and his work [2].

By far the most striking passage where ἄγαλμα occurs is the beautiful verses in the *Hekabe.* Talthybios is relating the manner of Polyxena's death—

> λαβοῦσα πέπλους ἐξ ἄκρας ἐπωμίδος
> ἔρρηξε λαγόνας εἰς μέσας παρ' ὀμφαλόν,
> μαστούς τ' ἔδειξε στέρνα θ', ὡς ἀγάλματος
> κάλλιστα [3].

She rent her peplos, and bared for the fatal stroke as fair and beautiful a bosom as was ever made in art. There is scarcely a more

[1] Cf. Brunn, *Griechische Kunstgeschichte*, ii. p. 63.

[2] *Nem.* iv. 94.

[3] vs. 558 ff. Cf. p. 75 below, where another instance of ἄγαλμα, 'painting,' occurs.

impressive scene in literature. Euripides has called in art to assist him in working out the situation as he felt it ought to be. The result is that we stand face to face with a scene whose pathos is as deep as the soul can feel. Let us see whether the comparison is the poet's own, or whether he had borrowed the notion from a painting or a work in marble. Pausanias gives a clue to such paintings. In the room on the left (we call it the Pinakotheke), as he entered the Propylaia, he saw among other paintings 'Polyxena about to be offered at the tomb of Achilles[1].' Again, in the painting of Polygnotos in the Lesche of the Knidians at Delphi, Pausanias saw Polyxena with her hair done up in the fashion of maidens. Poets sing of her death on the tomb of Achilles, while he himself had seen the sacrifice in paintings in Athens and in Pergamon[2]. Such a famous work as Polygnotos' wall painting at Delphi would hardly have escaped the notice of Euripides; much less the gallery on his own Acropolis, where he often passed the work. It has been maintained that no less an artist than Polygnotos must be considered the author of all the Pinakotheke paintings, since Pausanias

[1] 1. 22. 6. [2] 10. 25. 10.

says that two of the ten were by him. If this be a correct conclusion, there is the possibility that Euripides felt an impulse to record an impression of the work of the great painter[1]. Supposing, however, that this is not the case, the fact remains that in these verses the poet displays a warmth of artistic feeling, and has manifested a sense of beauty which will not suffer when compared with the noblest creations of the fifth-century artists.

The only distinct reference to portrait-work occurs in the *Alkestis*[2]. Admetos, in order to comfort himself in his sorrow, and to fill, in a way, the place made vacant by the death of his wife, declares—

> σοφῇ δὲ χειρὶ τεκτόνων δέμας τὸ σὸν
> εἰκασθὲν ἐν λέκτροισιν ἐκταθήσεται,
> ᾧ προσπεσοῦμαι καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας
> ὄνομα καλῶν σόν . . . . . .

[1] Robert, *Homerische Becher*, p. 75, thinks that Polygnotos was incapable of painting so pathetic a figure as Euripides' Polyxena. He would date the Pinakotheke painting, moreover, from the fourth century B.C., where it, as well as the terra-cotta relief cup showing the sacrifice (Berlin Antiquarium, inv. no. 3161, p. 73 ff. *op. cit.*), was made as direct illustrations of Euripides' text. Cf. further for these paintings, Overbeck, *Arch. Miscellen*, p. 8 ff.; Furtwängler, *Sammlung Sabouroff, Vasen, Einleitung*, p. 6.

[2] vs. 348 ff.

This image of his wife he shall call by name, and believe, although it be not true, that he is holding the real Alkestis in his arms. Could the marble be more beautiful than the words which describe it all? The undercurrent, which lends to the early part of the play the air of a felicitous modern home, comes nowhere more plainly to the surface than here.

A worthy parallel to this passage is preserved in the fragments of the *Andromeda*[1]. Perseus has come in his journey to the rock where the daughter of Kepheus is chained—

> ἔα, τίν' ὄχθον τόνδ' ὁρῶ περίρρυτον
> ἀφρῷ θαλάσσης; παρθένου τ' εἰκώ τινα
> ἐξ αὐτομόρφων λαΐνων τυκισμάτων
> σοφῆς ἄγαλμα χειρός.

'Ah! what cliff is here, washed by the wave of the sea? And a maiden's figure hewn from the living rock, an image from a skilled hand.' These lines as well as those above show that the artistic in Euripides had real depth. He sees with an artist's eye. Nothing speaks for the picturesque in the situation of Perseus and Andromeda more forcibly than the various monuments still preserved that were inspired by this vision of

[1] fr. 125.

the poet. The vase paintings make the most important class of ancient representations of the scene[1]. Then there comes the long line of Pompeian wall paintings, which represent always a later moment when the rescue is about complete[2]. Exactly the time of Perseus' arrival is seen on a remarkably fine little terra-cotta group of the fourth century[3]. The work is from Athens, and unquestionably illustrates the words of Euripides above. Andromeda, arms extended, is fastened to the perpendicular cliff. Immediately below her on the left stands Perseus, with face turned upward. He looks inquiringly at the outstretched figure. Andromeda's longing gaze into his puzzled eyes is evidently soon to disabuse him of the illusion that he sees a rock image before him[4].

[1] Cf. *Jahrbuch*, 1896, p. 292 ff. for the Berlin vase inv. no. 3237, and *Annali d' Inst.* 1872, p. 108 ff., and Heydemann in 7. *Halle'sches Winckelmannsprogram*, p. 9 ff.

[2] Nos. 1183–1203 in Helbig's *Wandgemälde der vom Vesuv verschütteten Städte Campaniens.*

[3] In the Berlin Antiquarium. Very poorly published in *Arch. Ztg.* 1879, pl. 11. Cf. *ibid.* p. 99 f.

[4] A fragment of a terra-cotta relief in the Munich Antiquarium (no. 668, height 0.235 m., width 0.142 m., thickness 0.022 m.) shows a youthful male figure, nearly full profile, with the chlamys on his left shoulder as on the Berlin Perseus. The garment is so twisted about the left hand that it is uncertain whether he carried something in it as the pouch Perseus regularly has. The

In leaving this remarkable passage I cannot but refer to an expression of Euripides which illustrates well in another connexion the deep vein of the artistic. It was no veneering where he felt the force in the flow of the peplos. The Greek dress was, as his ῥυθμὸν πέπλων[1] plainly shows, a thing of beauty, and in these words one can see hardly less eloquence than in the Parthenon Frieze.

The ships waiting at Aulis for a favourable wind are described as having a variety of figures for prow or deck ornaments[2]. Pallas on her winged chariot, with cloven-hoofed steeds, adorns the deck of the ship belonging to Theseus' son. This was a good omen for the sailors. That Athena should be given a quadriga might appear at first sight a little strange. As a matter of fact her connexion with a chariot in works of art is not wide. The most important monument repre-

face, somewhat injured, is turned up towards some object, and the same curious look which the Berlin relief shows on Perseus characterizes the youth. The fragment is out of the collection of a Swedish sculptor, Fogelberg, who lived in Rome. The similarity between it and the Perseus figure in the Berlin piece leads me to conjecture that the Munich Antiquarium possesses in this fragment a part of another Perseus-Andromeda scene.

I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. Thiersch, assistant in the Antiquarium, for the measurements and other special information in this matter.

[1] *Herakleidai*, v. 130.

[2] *Iph. A.* vs. 250 ff.

senting her in this relation was, so far as I know, the group in the west gable of the Parthenon. Here, as Carrey's drawing shows us, Nikē held the horses of Athena during her engagement with Poseidon. It is probable, likewise, that the interpretation of a metope, on the east side of the Parthenon, as Athena with *winged* steeds is a correct one[1]. We may distinguish further two occasions where Athena either drives a chariot or is intimately associated with one. The most common of these two represents the goddess in company with Herakles, probably meant to indicate the hero's transfer to Olympos, although there is difficulty in reading this in the scene when, as is often the case, Athena stands by the horses instead of being on the chariot. Both black and red figured vases show numerous representations of this type[2]. Athena appears again on the battle-field in a chariot, but merely as a spectator. Such is the case on a Lower Italy vase, on which is painted the battle of the Greeks and barbarians[3]. One

[1] Cf. Michaelis, *Parthenon*, pl. 5, vii.

[2] Cf. Gerhard, *Auserl. Vasen*. pl. 136–139 and *Mon. d. Inst.* iv. pl. 41 = Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, i. fig. 737. Nos. 68, 69, 545 and 1215 in Munich are all black figured vases representing the same scene.

[3] Naples, no. 3256. Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* ii. pl. 30. Robert,

should not forget that Euripides in the *Ion* (v. 1570) brings Athena in on a quadriga, as does also Aischylos in the *Eumenides*, v. 405.

On each of the fifty Boeotian vessels the stern piece was a Kadmos with a golden dragon. Gerenian Nestor and his followers had for their emblem the river-god Alpheus in a bull's form. The definiteness with which these signs are named gives an air of reality to them. While no doubt arbitrarily selected for their place, they are of interest as showing that Euripides did not permit the opportunity to pass without contriving extensive and picturesque monuments.

3. *Painting.*

Reference has already been made to the tradition that Euripides was in early life a painter. The rejection of this story as well as other details of his biography is not a healthy policy in philological criticism, and cannot be productive of any better understanding of the poet. On the contrary, when one holds to Euripides the painter, he has much to assist him in accounting for the work of Euripides the poet. How-

in 18. *Hallē'sches Winckelmannsprogram*, uses this picture in restoring the Battle of Marathon in the Stoa Poikilē.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ever amateurish his work in art may have been, it affords us, if we accept it as a fact, the key to his originality in introducing the artistic.

Direct allusions to paintings, although not abundant, are still adequate to assure one of the poet's love of the art. Hippolytos declares his purity and innocence of life—he knows nothing of the affair which the world calls Love, except what he has learned by hearsay and from the Love-scenes in *paintings*[1]. The endless number of vases which show us the coquetting and amorous groups of Athenian youths and maidens are adequate evidence that this subject was, from the beginning of the fifth century B.C. at least, a favourite theme for vase decorators. Hippolytos therefore is speaking quite within the bounds of truth when he remarks that he had noticed Love in this form. Hekabe, in reflecting upon the prospects of slavery and the attending sea voyage, begins: 'as for myself, I have never been on board a ship, yet I understand what it would be, judging from what I have heard and from the *paintings* that I have seen[2].' The vase paintings, again, illustrate well what the maritime activity of the Greeks was. Nautical scenes were no less inviting than the

[1] *Hipp.* v. 1005.

[2] *Troad.* vs. 686 ff.

proximity of the sea was inspiring to the artist. The latter early learned to include this phase of the daily life of the people in the subjects thrown on the vases. Even on the Dipylon ware[1] the ship at sea was a common subject for representation. Moreover, it must be remembered that when the story of the Battle of Marathon was told by Polygnotos on the wall paintings in the Stoa Poikilē, the Phoenician vessels were a part of the scene[2]. Euripides' audience might think of actual paintings, if they chose, for these were on every side. Better still, they might raise their eyes from the stage before them and cast a glance at the blue horizon to the south, where a picture of ships at sea would meet their gaze, such as painter never knew how to make. Hekabe takes occasion another time to air her artistic taste. A Trojan captive, face to face with Agamemnon her lord, she bids him have compassion on her—'look, take your stand as a painter would, view my misery'[3].

[1] Fragments of twenty-seven ships on Dipylon vases have been brought together by Pernice in *Athen. Mitth.* 1892, p. 285 ff. Cf. also the Dionysiac boat-race on the Nikosthenes kylix, *J. H. S.* 1885, pl. 49; also *Vorlegeblätter*, 1888, pl. 5, 3[b], pl. 7, 1[a]; and *ibid.* 1890–91, pl. 6, 2, for numerous other examples of ships in vase paintings.

[2] Paus. 1. 15. 3.

[3] *Hek.* vs. 807 ff.

What could be more effective than such words in such a situation? The human element in Hekabe takes fresh hold on a modern reader when he hears her uttering this striking simile.

The same chord is hit again, where Helen mourns the beauty which had cursed her—

> εἴθ' ἐξαλειφθεῖσ', ὡς ἄγαλμ', αὖθις πάλιν
> αἴσχιον εἶδος ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ 'λαβον [1].

'Would to Heaven this beauty had been erased as from a picture, and that in its stead I had had an ugly form.' In this case ἄγαλμα seems to have the sense of γραφή, a use which certainly has no parallel in dramatic literature, unless it be in the above passage from the *Hekabe* describing the death of Polyxena. The verb ἐξαλείφω is used only in this connexion, as in another passage from Euripides when practically the same idea is expressed—

> ὅν γ' ἐξαλείφει ῥᾷον ἢ γραφὴν θεός [2].

Prosperity does not exist among mortals, for 'Fate eradicates this more easily than a painting.' This reminds one of Aischylos [3]. These last three examples appear to me to argue strongly

[1] *Hel.* vs. 262 f. [2] fr. 618. [3] Cf. p. 19 above.

for the tradition of an artist Euripides. He refers in another place[1] to the battle of the gods and giants in paintings, and no doubt remembers as he does so that there was not a person who heard his words or read them who did not see, almost daily, representations of the *κλόνον γιγάντων*. On vases the fight occurred *ad satietatem*, while the peplos for the sacred image of Athena on the Acropolis was again called to mind. Its brilliant colors rendered it no less impressive than a veritable painting.

Nowhere, however, does one approach a definite work so closely as in the *Ion*. The picture becomes quite clear.

Ion. *ἐκ γῆς πατρός σου πρόγονος ἔβλαστεν πατήρ;*
Kreousa. *Ἐριχθόνιός γε· τὸ δὲ γένος μ' οὐκ ὠφελεῖ.*
Ion. *ἦ καί σφ' Ἀθάνα γῆθεν ἐξανείλετο;*
Kreousa. *εἰς παρθένους γε χεῖρας, οὐ τεκοῦσά νιν.*
Ion. *δίδωσι δ', ὥσπερ ἐν γραφῇ νομίζεται*[2]*;*

'And did the progenitor of your father spring from Earth?'

'Yes, Erichthonios, but my race avails me nought.'

'And did not Athena receive him from the Earth?'

[1] *Phoin.* v. 128.

[2] *Ion*, vs. 267 ff.

'Yes, to her virgin arms, but she was not his mother.'

'And did she dispose of him *as the paintings show it*?'

Ion has a definite notion of the manner of Erichthonios' birth, and he has learned it all from a painting or paintings. His memory serves him well, and he plies Kreousa with questions till he is satisfied whether his idea of the affair tallies with her account. Euripides goes over all this through Ion with a large interest in the story. It looks as though he were hinting at a recent and important painting by some master in Athens. The glorification of the capital and the local myths is so plainly the tendency of the whole tragedy, and the Attic legend is being given in it so thoroughly the stamp of history, that a new painting which represented the birth of the patron god was by no means to be omitted from the recital of the creed. As a matter of fact the legend seems to date from the first half of the fifth century B. C.[1]

[1] Mythologists may go back to a much earlier date for the inception of the myth, but the vase paintings seem to be valuable evidence for a fifth-century revival in its sacredness, if not for the fifth-century origin. The black figured vase painters can hardly have had this popular subject from which to draw.

One is led to this conclusion from the circumstance that the story did not gain any place in art before this time. Popular as such a subject must have been with the Athenians from its first conception it would at once have been popular for the vase painters and artists in general. It is first in the later severe red figured vases that the story makes its appearance to any great extent. The oldest record we have of it is in the famous terra-cotta relief in the Berlin Antiquarium[1].

Not much later than the terra cotta come three vase paintings[2]. In all of these Gē, with body half out of the earth, reaches up the infant 'to the virgin arms' of Athena. In none of them is the later moment shown where the goddess delivers him to the daughters of Kekrops. Since the latter are often present the scene may be considered all one and the same. Euripides simply makes Ion enlarge the picture to cover more time. All the monuments

[1] Published in *Arch. Ztg.* 1872, pl. 63, and by Harrison, *op. cit.* p. xxviii.

[2] (*a*) No. 345 in Munich. Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* i. pl. 10, and *Élite Céram.* i. pl. 84 = Müller-Wieseler, *Denkmäler der alten Kunst*, i. 211[a].

(*b*) Camuccini Coll. Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* iii. pl. 30, and *Élite Céram.* i. pl. 85[a] = *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, ser. 3, pl. 2.

(*c*) Gerhard's *Auserl. Vasen.* ii. pl. 151 = *Élite Céram.* i. pl. 85.

show the same scene—the child is being handed over to Athena. On the Berlin kylix[1], which is by far the most beautiful of the vase pictures, Kekrops in long coils[2] is present as usual, and besides there are Hephaistos and the three daughters of Kekrops—Herse, Aglauros, and Pandrosos, together with Erechtheus and a certain Hellas. One really sees the drama performed before him. I always felt on frequent study of this beautiful picture that the vase painter was indebted to some large work of national repute. It is this, perhaps, that Euripides recalls for his audience[3].

4. *Weaving and Embroidery.*

This feature, so pronounced in the youngest of the three tragedians, does not make its appearance in the other two. The artistic in Euripides cannot be studied to better advantage than in the various works of the loom which he

[1] No. 2537. Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* x. pl. 39 and by Harrison, *op. cit.* p. xxix. The main scene is also in Roscher's *Lexikon*, i. p. 1305. This vase, which must be dated *cir.* 440 B.C., is considerably nearer the date of the *Ion* than any of the other works referred to.

[2] Cf. v. 1164.

[3] Lucian, *De domo* 27, mentions a painting showing the birth, but adds that some older work was the suggestion for it. The παλαιά τις γραφή suggests the possible influence of the fifth-century paintings.

brings into use. The pleasure he had in using his eyes and in picturing the designs in the woven garments distinguishes him easily from any other poet. Where the stuff of a garment attracts Euripides, and he sees in it all sorts of pictures and a splendor which dazzles us by its richness, Aischylos goes on in a plain matter-of-fact way, giving little attention to his ὕφασμα[1], and Sophokles omits the whole affair. It would be interesting to know whether the latter would have had any designs worked into the web. One is left to conclude from his silence on this point that it was a bit of luxury in which Sophokles had no interest.

The most extensive passage is in the *Ion*, where the servant of Kreousa relates to the chorus of Attic maidens the celebration of Xouthos in honour of his recovered son[2]. I give the whole description. 'And when Kreousa's husband Xouthos left the oracle, he went with his new son to the feast and to the sacrifices which he was going to make to the gods. He went to where the Bacchic flames burst forth, that he might sprinkle with the blood of slaughtered victims the double crags of the god's mountain in honour of his son. He said

[1] Cf. p. 21 above.

[2] vs. 1122–1165.

to the boy, 'Remain here, and erect with the help of skilled hands a solid tent, and, if I stay rather long at the sacrifice, have the servants ready to wait upon our friends.' He took the cattle and was off, while the youth had the wall-less circumference of the sacred shelter constructed with upright shafts, and had it well protected from the hot rays at noon and again from the sun when setting. He fixed the length of the equal sides at a plethron each, which gave for the interior a space of ten thousand square feet, enough, as those who know declare, to accommodate all the Delphians at the feast.' For that which follows I must give the Greek:—

λαβὼν δ' ὑφάσμαθ' ἱερὰ θησαυρῶν πάρα
κατεσκίαζε, θαύματ' ἀνθρώποις ὁρᾶν.
πρῶτον μὲν ὀρόφῳ πτέρυγα περιβάλλει πέπλων,
ἀνάθημα Δίου παιδός, οὓς Ἡρακλέης
Ἀμαζόνων σκυλεύματ' ἤνεγκεν θεῷ.
ἐνῆν δ' ὑφανταὶ γράμμασιν τοιαίδ' ὑφαί·
Οὐρανὸς ἀθροίζων ἄστρ' ἐν αἰθέρος κύκλῳ·
ἵππους μὲν ἤλαυν' εἰς τελευταίαν φλόγα
Ἥλιος, ἐφέλκων λαμπρὸν Ἑσπέρου φάος,
μελάμπεπλος δὲ Νὺξ ἀσείρωτον ζυγοῖς
ὄχημ' ἔπαλλεν, ἄστρα δ' ὡμάρτει θεᾷ·
Πλειὰς μὲν ᾖει μεσοπόρου δι' αἰθέρος

ὅ τε ξιφήρης Ὠρίων, ὕπερθε δὲ
Ἄρκτος στρέφουσ' οὐραῖα χρυσήρει πόλῳ·
κύκλος δὲ παυσέληνος ἠκόντιζ' ἄνω
μηνὸς διχήρης, Ὑάδες τε ναυτίλοις
σαφέστατον σημεῖον, ἥ τε φωσφόρος
Ἕως διώκουσ' ἄστρα. τοίχοισιν δ' ἔπι
ἤμπισχεν ἄλλα βαρβάρων ὑφάσματα,
εὐηρέτμους ναῦς ἀντίας Ἕλληνίσιν,
καὶ μιξόθηρας φῶτας ἱππείας τ' ἄγρας
ἐλάφων λεόντων τ' ἀγρίων θηράματα.
κατ' εἰσόδους δὲ Κέκροπα θυγατέρων πέλας
σπείραις συνειλίσσουτ', Ἀθηναίων τινὸς
ἀνάθημα.

'He took then the sacred vestments, marvelous sights, from the treasure house, and hung them all about. First, on the ceiling he hung the folds of the peploi, which Herakles, the son of Zeus, had dedicated as spoils won in battle with the Amazons. The following scenes were woven in the cloth. Heaven marshaled the stars in the circumference of aether. Helios was there driving his horses over the last of his course, and bringing in his wake the bright light of Vesper. Then dark-robed Night hurried on her chariot with unyoked steeds, while accompanying the goddess were the

stars. The Pleiads kept a middle course through the air, and Orion, too, with sword in hand. Above all, about the golden pole, swung Arktos with averted face. The moon full orbed, which marks the months, shot upward with the Hyades, an unfailing sign for sailors, and Eos, bringer of light, put the stars to flight. On the walls were other garments from barbarian spoils. Ships well fitted with oars were matched against those of the Greeks. Then there was the wild, mixed breed of horse and man, and the wild lions attacking the deer. At the entrance there was a robe, the votive offering of some Athenian, which showed Kekrops creeping in his coils near by his daughters.' This tapestry is fairly alive with the pulsating life of the heavenly bodies. It is no longer the dull symbolism of the older time. The drama of morning, noon, and night is played by persons. Nothing emphasizes Euripides' modernness, his progressiveness, more than his sympathy with these new elements in art. While before there had been in poetry occasional mention of a chariot of Selene[1] or of Nyx[2], there had

[1] Earliest mention in Homeric Hymns *in Mercur.* v. 69 and *Cer.* v. 88. Again in Pindar, *Ol.* 3. v. 19.

[2] Aisch. *Choe.* v. 660.

never been such a panorama of personified elements. Euripides is a bold artist, and makes a magnificent picture. Ouranos is there first of all, as a background for the lively scene which was to follow. The Sun and Moon in their respective chariots, the one setting, the other rising, are artistic products of the Pheidian period. It is a well-known fact that the Sun sprang from the rippling waters of Okeanos in the east gable of the Parthenon, and that, according to the most widely accepted notion, Selene drove out of sight on the opposite margin. This combination of the two does not appear to have been made before the time of Pheidias. There are examples, both on black and severe red figured vase paintings, of the Sun driving his chariot, but Selene and the Stars still remained but symbolical forms. The poetic invention of the Periklean age first made such a scene as that on this tapestry a possible one. The Berlin pyxis [1], which may be dated *cir.* 440 B.C., is a beautiful example of the reality of Euripides' description. Helios rises from the water in his chariot, and even

[1] Published by Furtwängler, *Sammlung Sabouroff*, i. pl. 63 (cf. also the discussion given). Same again in Roscher's *Lexikon*, i. p. 2007.

before him Eos, winged, urges on her quadriga with all possible haste. Selene on her single steed rides away in confusion. Even more beautiful still is the painting on the celebrated Blacas krater in the British Museum[1]. Helios suddenly starts his four horses, two of which are winged, into an upward course. The Stars, in the form of naked boys who are bathing in Okeanos, are taken quite by surprise and they plunge out of sight. Here then is a literal 'pursuit' of which Euripides speaks. The latter, however, makes Eos perform this duty, while the vase painter represents her in the true Attic manner pursuing Kephalos. Over the hills to the left Selene disappears on her little horse. Nothing could surpass the freshness and idyllic beauty of this wonderful little painting. Euripides alone of the Greek writers has created for us in the Delphian tapestry the literary parallel to this picture. Numerous other vase paintings of the later period might be produced to show the unusual popularity of this subject[2], but these out of our poet's own

[1] Cat. vol. iii. no. 466. Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* ii. pl. 55; *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, ser. 2, pl. 9; Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, i. fig. 711; Roscher's *Lexikon*, ii. p. 2010; Welcker, *Alte Denk.* iii. pl. 9.

[2] For vases of all periods representing Helios in his chariot,

time are the essential ones. The Blacas vase, which is evidently a product of the period when Polygnotean frescoes were influencing the vase painters, stands in a particular connexion with the idealized canopy which the Delphians had over their heads at Xouthos' feast. It must be observed further in this place that nobody but a person with an artistic eye would have hit upon the fitness of covering a ceiling with the story of Helios and Ouranos. This magnificent description alone would place Euripides by himself among Greek writers of the classical period.

The barbarian ships set against the Greek are intended to recall one particular period. No Athenian, who heard these words in the fifth century B. C., would have thought of any other conflict between Greeks and barbarians than

cf. *Élite Céram.* ii. pl. 109–117; Gerhard, *Akad. Abhandlungen*, atlas, pl. 5 ff., and Roscher's *Lexikon*, s. *Mondgöttin*. The Hermitage vase, in fragments, published in *Compte Rendu*, 1861, pl. 3 discussed by Stephani, *ibid.* 1860, p. 77 ff., is of great interest as showing us Helios and Selene in their chariots—the former setting, the latter rising, full orbed as in Euripides' tapestry—before whom takes place the Bacchic revel. This is the scene in the temple gable as Pausanias says (10. 19. 4), i. e. with the addition of Selene which was a probable figure in the gable. We may be sure at least that Helios was not alone; either Selene or Nyx was a natural attendant for the other side.

those at Marathon and Salamis. The record of those days had inspired many an artist as well as poet. The memory of the brilliant victories which gave freedom to Greece and to Europe was cherished by every Hellene. The great master Polygnotos had done the battle of Marathon on one of the walls in the Stoa Poikilē, and had painted, too, the retreat of the barbarians to their ships with the Greeks in hot pursuit[1]. This is, however, but an accidental record of one such painting. Many others must have existed. One recalls here the frieze of the Nikē temple on the Acropolis, the subject of which is generally admitted to be the battle of Plataia[2]. The events of those great days had taken their place among the sacred happenings

[1] Paus. 1. 15. 3.

[2] So Furtwängler, *Masterpieces*, p. 442 ff., and Overbeck, *Griechische Plastik*, 4th ed. i. p. 481 ff. Cf. also Kekulé, *Die Reliefs an der Balustrade der Athena Nikē*, p. 17, and Friederich-Wolters, *Bausteine*, p. 281 ff. It is worthy of note in this place that an inscription recently discovered by the Greek Arch. Soc. in their excavations on the north slope of the Acropolis, promises to finally settle the question as to the period when the Nikē temple was built. While opinions have hitherto varied between a time previous to the building of the Propylaia and the first decade of the Peloponnesian war, Kavvadias believes the inscription fixes it at *cir.* 450 B.C. We may wait with interest his publication of the same. Cf. the temporary report in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for Sept. 11, 1897, p. 1151.

of the mythical time, and were equally honoured in art and literature.

The allusion to the centaurs may suggest the fight with the Lapiths which, like the Gigantomachia, was told on the Parthenon metopes and a hundred other places whither Greek art had spread. Wild beasts attacking their prey has been from Homer till the present a handy subject for a painter in words or colors. The second introduction of Kekrops, with the remark that some Athenian had dedicated the garment, impresses one more than ever with the idea that Euripides had before his mind some prominent work painted in Athens. The presence of his daughters here and the peculiar serpentine extremities of their father supplement the brevity of the scene as described before[1].

Later in the *Ion* the poet has recourse again to the texture of a garment to assist in the *dénouement*[2]. Ion will know whether Kreousa really is his mother, and he asks her if the box he has is empty or not. She replies at once that it contains the swaddling clothes in which she once wrapped him as a babe. 'But what sort of clothes are they, for maidens weave many a pattern?' 'It is all in an unfinished

[1] vs. 271 ff. [2] vs. 1412–1427.

state, a bit of a sample cast from the loom.' 'But what form has it? Be definite.' Kreousa then makes the following description of the details—

> Γοργὼν μὲν ἐν μέσοισιν ἠτρίοις πέπλων
> κεκρασπέδωται δ' ὄφεσιν αἰγίδος τρόπον.

The ornament tells its own story. Euripides cannot rid himself of the splendor of the Aigis and Gorgon on the Athena statues. As the Gorgon was inseparably associated with Athena, so the Athena of this time was none other than the Parthenos.

Iphigeneia bewails her fate in the inhospitable Taurian land. She has neither husband, children, home, nor friends. Neither does she chant the praises of the Argive Hera, nor weave upon the sweet voiced loom the image of Athena Atthis and the Titans. The chorus of captive Trojans in the *Hekabe*[1] remembers likewise this corner stone of Attic myth and art. They wonder whither they are to be carried in their captivity. 'Shall I go to the city of Pallas, and on the saffron-hued peplos yoke the steeds of Athena to the beautiful car, working in the crocus-coloured web with fancy hues, or shall

[1] vs. 466 ff

I weave the race of giants whom Zeus the son of Kronos settled with his bolt of fire?' These passages bring to our mind again[1] the lively interest Euripides enjoyed in the story of the Battle of the Gods and Giants as told in art. In this particular connexion he means of course the peplos which formed the object of the great Panathenaic Procession. He reverts to the mythic combat graphically but not reverently. The whole affair evidently had no religious significance for him. It was no overthrowing of evil transgressors by the holy powers of Olympos. The story, for that is all it meant to him, appealed to him simply as it was told in art—only for art's sake. It is the dramatic or picturesque handling given it in the woof, the marble, or the fresco that receives his worship.

Orestes is able to recall a garment that Iphigeneia had woven when at home in Argos[2]. It was filled with the quarrel of Atreus and Thyestes, together with an eclipse of the sun. This latter has reference to the sign which Zeus promised to show Atreus when the Golden Lamb was stolen from him by Thyestes[3].

[1] Vid. p. 52 f. above. [2] *Iph. T.* vs. 811 ff.
[3] *Elekt.* vs. 718 ff.

It is not possible to determine what time of the famous ἔρις is meant. The affair never found its way into any work of art which has reached us, nor into any work of which we have a literary record, except this vestment described by Euripides. Judging, however, from what has been pointed out as so characteristic of this author, we have reason to believe that the family feud between Atreus and Thyestes was not unknown in the fifth century art. He has more than likely transferred into his verse the scenes with which he was actually acquainted[1].

5. *Miscellany.*

In the *Elektra* where Orestes and Pylades had been invited into the hovel of Autourgos, and Elektra had dismissed the latter to get provisions with which to entertain the guests, the chorus of Argive women turn abruptly from the events of the play to sing about the armor of Achilles. Nowhere is the secondary importance of the Euripidean chorus shown to better advantage than just here. The song begins and

[1] Reference should be made to the cloth which Penelope is weaving on a vase of *cir.* 430 B.C. published in *Mon. d. Inst.* 9, pl. 42; Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, iii. fig. 2332. Zones of animals are woven in, and the appearance of the fragment as it stands in the loom is a good commentary on these tapestry excursions of Euripides. Cf. also Demeter's dress on the Hieron kylix, *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, ser. A, pl. 7.

ends with Achilles and the armor [1]. The whole is foisted in to afford the poet an opportunity to display his taste on the make-up of a shield, helmet, and spear. However unsuccessful the work may be judged when compared with the eighteenth Iliad, no one can charge Euripides with being a slavish borrower. There are no monotonous decorations in concentric circles such as were used by the author of the *Ἡρακλέους ἀσπίς*. The Oriental elaborateness which served the Epic time had its place in the long ago. Achilles' shield can be separated with difficulty from the hexameter. The imagination, indeed, has most to do, and the reason very little. One cannot rid himself of the feeling that the whole, beautiful though it is, is in substance a poetical fiction [2]. While Euripides took his *idea* from Homer, he got his *inspiration* from Athens. He stood on the vantage ground of Pheidias, and gave armor to Achilles that might in reality have been made in the fifth century B. C. Let us see what it was. The Nereids left Hephaistos and his golden anvil, and traversed

[1] vs. 432-486.

[2] Vid. Brunn, *Kunst bei Homer*, for an able defence of the shield and clever arguments for the possible existence of such a work in Homer's time. Reichel's *Die Homerischen Waffen* gives the most satisfactory treatment of the shield from the vantage ground of the Mykenaian finds.

with the armor the Euboean shores; they passed Pelion and Ossa, the haunts of the Nymphs, and the scenes Achilles had known in his youth. An air of reality is given to the events and the armor, for the chorus had heard the description from the lips of a Nauplian who had witnessed the terrible shudder that ran through the ranks of the Phrygians on beholding Achilles. On the circumference of the famous shield were worked the following fearful sights:—

περιδρόμῳ μὲν ἵτυος ἕδρᾳ
Περσέα λαιμοτόμαν ὑπὲρ
ἁλὸς ποτανοῖσι πεδί-
λοισι φυὰν Γοργόνος ἴ-
σχειν, Διὸς ἀγγέλῳ σὺν Ἑρμᾷ,
τῷ Μαίας ἀγροτῆρι κούρῳ·
ἐν δὲ μέσῳ κατέλαμπε σάκει φαέθων
κύκλος ἀελίοιο
ἵπποις ἂν πτεροέσσαις
ἄστρων τ' αἰθέριοι χοροί,
Πλειάδες Ὑάδες, Ἔκτορος
ὄμμασι τροπαῖοι· vs. 458–469.

Perseus escaping with the Medusa head was on the shield of Herakles[1]. It was there the work of Hephaistos, and accordingly all possible licence is used in describing the figure. The

[1] Hes. *Scut.* v. 216 ff.

pouch in which he carried the head was silver, and Perseus himself was not fastened on the shield—a curious paradox—for the workmanship had been so cunning that he hovered in the air without any visible support. Behind followed the Gorgons, and the pursuit was so hot that the shield echoed with the roar. The composition of this poem is to be placed at *cir.* 650 B. C., perhaps not more than a generation earlier than the Kypselos chest, on which the earliest occurrence of this scene is traceable [1]. While Perseus alone pursued by the Gorgons occurs in these two earliest records [2], the complete scene, as the early vases show the picture, is Perseus accompanied by Hermes or Athena and followed by the Gorgons [3]. The flight is oftener represented in abridged form where Perseus and Athena alone appear, or Perseus and Hermes, as on our shield. It must be noted also that the slayer of Medusa was not an unknown character

[1] Paus. 5. 18. 5.

[2] It is worth observing that vs. 228 ff. of the *Scutum*, where the Gorgons and their pursuit are introduced, is a later interpolation, and no doubt is from the time when the extended scene appeared on the archaic vase paintings.

[3] Cf. Gerhard, *Trinkschalen*, pl. 2; Müller-Wieseler, ii. no. 897; Gerhard, *Auserl. Vasen.* i. pl. 88; cf. also *J. H. S.* 1884, pl. 43. This kylix, on which the whole procession occurs, shows further two naked male figures in the line. Their only significance is that of 'fill-figures.'

in marble. Pausanias records a Perseus on the Acropolis, the work of Myron. It appears probable from the expression used that he was represented here, also, escaping with the Gorgon's head[1]. The remaining decorations on the shield illustrate the unbounded pleasure in the personified which Euripides manifested in the case of the tapestry at Delphi. Achilles' shield in Homer likewise had the glory of the Sun and Stars upon it, but the Sun drove no chariot there drawn by winged horses. It has been pointed out above[2] that this element distinguishes the vase paintings and sculpture of the Periklean age from all that had gone before. Our poet emblazons his hero's shield with the best and latest artistic novelties of the day. One can comprehend the idea of the decoration, by setting before his mind some such a scene as that on the Blacas krater[3]. In this connexion we may turn aside long enough to note that the Sun in his quadriga possessed a living interest for Euripides. The charming lyric, which Ion sings as he busies himself with the

[1] Paus. 1. 23. 7. The same is likely mentioned by Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 34. 57. A Perseus head in the Brit. Mus. (published in *J. H. S.* 1881, pl. 9) and another in Rome (Furtwängler, *Masterpieces*, fig. 83, cf. also *ibid.* p. 197 ff.) are to be considered late copies of Myron's Perseus.

[2] P. 84 f.

[3] Vid. note 1, p. 85.

offices of temple attendant[1], opens with the Sun's chariot rising in splendor over Parnassos' peaks. He drives the Stars to seek protection with sacred Night. The same beautiful figure occurs again in a fragment of the *Phaethon*[2], and in some verses out of the *Andromeda*[3] sacred Night directs her chariot midst the starry tracts. Such pictures as these are well calculated to reflect a substantial commentary on the vase paintings of this period, and on the motives invented by Pheidias for the Parthenon[4], and employed again in the pediment of the Apollo temple in Delphi.

The description of the helm and other armor follows:—

> ἐπὶ δὲ χρυσοτύπῳ κράνει
> Σφίγγες ὄνυξιν ἀοίδιμον
> ἄγραν φέρουσαι· περιπλεύ-
> ρῳ δὲ κύτει πύρπνοος ἔ-
> σπευδε δρόμῳ λέαινα χαλαῖς
> Πειρηναῖον ὁρῶσα πῶλον.
> ἐν δὲ δόρει φονίῳ τετραβάμονες ἵπποι ἔπαλλον
> κελαινὰ δ' ἀμφὶ νῶθ' ἵετο κόνις. VS. 470 ff.

[1] *Ion*, vs. 82 ff. [2] fr. 475. [3] fr. 114.

[4] When judged solely from these literary evidences and the vase paintings, Furtwängler's theory that Nyx occupied the corresponding angle with Helios in the east gable of the Parthenon, has much in its favour. Vid. *Masterpieces*, p. 465.

When Euripides speaks of the helmet as of gold, and goes on to state that there were Sphinxes crouched upon it holding their prey, there is no mistaking where he got his model. This notion of a Sphinx on a helm can not be detected before Pheidias' time. The Athena Parthenos is indeed the earliest instance of this motive, and her great helm served as a pattern for all succeeding head-pieces where one finds crouching animals as part of the decoration [1]. Euripides has simply taken the famous helm of the goddess and worked it over to suit the case of Achilles. By adding the victims in the claws of the Sphinxes he does not make a slavish copy of Pheidias' work [2]. The Parthenos appears, judging from the most reliable copies of the head [3], to have had one

[1] The squirrel-like animal whose tail forms the crest of a warrior's helm on a black figured vase of the British Museum (published in *Vorlegeblätter*, 1889, pl. 3, 3^b) is the only instance I recall of any such thing. This, however, is no forerunner of the Athena helmet.

[2] Paus. 1. 24. 5.

[3] The Aspasios Jasper in Vienna, published in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, iii. fig. 1456, and gold medallions from Kertsch, found in 1830, published in *Athen. Mitth.* 1883, pl. 15. There is also a long list of Attic tetradrachma which show the head. Later copies in marble—Varvakeion statuette; the polychrome head in the Berlin Museum, published in *Antike Denk.* i. pl. 3 = Collignon, *Histoire de la Sculpture*, i. p. 544. Cf. also the Farnese Athena and the

Sphinx in the centre and on either side a crouching four-legged animal, most generally recognized as a Pegasos. Pausanias says, to be sure, that these latter figures were Gryphons, but his words are to be taken as referring not to the figures on the top of the helm but to the reliefs worked on the cheek-pieces. These being turned up he had not seen the springing Pegasoi or four-footed animals behind[1]. The plurality of Sphinxes on Achilles' shield takes the place of the variety of animals which the St. Petersburg medallions and many other monuments show as about to spring over the front rim. This important feature of the Parthenos helm is fully proved for us, not by Hellenistic or Roman copies, but by such a fifth-century product as the gold medallions. In this particular again the Pheidian spirit of Euripides comes to the surface[2]. We may be assured that if the sculptor had not invented the new designs for the Parthenos helm, Euripides would never

Albani Athena, published in Clarac's *Musée de Sculpture*, pl. 458 : vid. also Furtwängler, *op. cit.* p. 76, note 3.

[1] This has been pointed out by Kieseritzky, *Athen. Mitth.* 1883, p. 298 ff., and substantially supported by figures which show the relative frequency of Pegasoi and other animals on the copies of the helm.

[2] The wide influence exerted on plastic by the Parthenos helm was well pointed out by Lange, *Athen. Mitth.* 1881, p. 84 f.

have given his Achilles the helm which he did. Perhaps it was a gratification to the Athenians to learn that their Pallas had, after all, the same designs that were on Achilles' famous helmet.

So far as I have been able to learn, κύτει (v. 473) has been understood here to mean shield, a sense that does not in any way fit in with the description of the armor. The poet proceeds in natural order from helm to shield, and it follows of itself that he proceeds to other parts of the outfit and does not revert again to the shield which was left ready in v. 469. It seems clear to me that the word must be interpreted here in its literal meaning 'concavity,' and have reference to the breastplate. This was strictly περιπλευρος, even more than a shield. This interpretation renders the progress of the description natural and sensible. Following upon the account of shield and helm is the description of cuirass and spear. On the former of the two latter was the fire-breathing Chimaira engaging Bellerophon. This group, which appeared on the Delphi metopes, has been discussed above[1]. The breastplates on the vase paintings do not assist us in

[1] P. 50 f. It should be observed that the Chimaira is painted on the shield of Kodros in the inside picture of the Kodros kylix in Bologna. Cf. *Vorlegeblätter*, ser. i. pl. 4, and Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, iii. p. 1998.

tracing such devices. As a matter of fact the composition of the body armor does not appear to have admitted of any sort of decoration except that painted on, and the plies and joints did not furnish an adequate surface for even this manner of ornamentation[1]. There comes, lastly, the brief mention of the spear on which were prancing horses followed by a cloud of dust. One may think of these figures as inlaid either with other metal or precious stone. Although remains of such spears have not reached us out of classical times, the famous dagger-point[2] from the fourth 'Shaft-grave' at Mykenai, with its lion hunt of numerous inlaid metals, is a fine example of what this sort of art once was in Greece, and of what it no doubt continued to be in the later centuries.

In handling the attack of the Seven against

[1] Cf. a red figured vase of the late severe style, published in Millingen, *Peintures de vases*, 49. Two human figures and the forequarters of a horse are given a prominent place on the breastplate. On an archaic bronze cuirass, said to have been found in the bed of the Alpheus river (published in *B. C. H.* 1883, pl. 1, 2, 3), are extensive engravings. Apollo, Artemis, and Leto on the right, facing whom on the left are three mortals. The upper part of the armor is covered with oxen, lions, and sphinxes.

[2] Published in *B. C. H.* x. pl. 2; Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, ii. fig. 1190. Six similar blades were discovered in the fourth and fifth graves. Cf. Schuchhardt's *Schliemann's Ausgrabungen*, p. 300.

Thebes Euripides followed closely in the steps of Aischylos. In no particular is the dependence of the former more apparent than in the account of the shields which the heroes carried. So striking is the influence of the older poet on the younger that where Aischylos gave no device to Amphiaraos' shield, Euripides also expressly states the same thing in regard to it. The description of the six given by the messenger must be considered in detail[1].

1. *Parthenopaios.*

> ἐπίσημ' ἔχων οἰκεῖον ἐν μέσῳ σάκει,
> ἐκηβόλοις τόξοισιν Ἀταλάντην κάπρον
> χειρουμένην Αἰτωλόν.

This scene of the Kalydonian Hunt was a favourite one from the time of the Kypselos Chest[2] to the decay of the ceramic art in Lower Italy. The earliest extant representation of the great episode is to be found on an Attic monument—the François vase. Like the Labours of Herakles, during all periods of Greek art the wonderful feat of Atalanta and Meleager was a popular subject. It is well known that Skopas

[1] *Phoin.* vs. 1107 ff.

[2] Paus. 5. 19. 2.

represented this scene in the front gable of the large temple of Athena Alea at Tegea[1].

2. *Hippomedon.*

ἔστειχ' ἔχων σημεῖον ἐν μέσῳ σάκει
στικτοῖς πανόπτην ὄμμασιν δεδορκότα.

Where Aischylos has the abstraction of Night, Moon, and Stars (*Septem*, v. 388), Euripides prefers to introduce this idea in another form and selects Argos with his hundred eyes, part of which served by night and part by day. The Argos-Io episode is of very frequent occurrence on vases. The very words used here, *στικτοῖς πανόπτην ὄμμασιν*, are as fully picturesque as the picture on the vases[2], where the full-length figure of Argos, attacked by Hermes, is literally covered with eyes from head to foot. It would be difficult to illustrate the poet's words more forcibly than the vases do. As a matter of fact there was no reason why, on any visit to the Potters' quarter, Euripides could not have seen just such paintings.

[1] Paus. 8. 45. 5 and 6.

[2] (*a*) Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* ii. pl. 59, 5 = *Élite Céram.* iii. pl. 100. On actual count there are 134 eyes on the figure.

(*b*) No. 338 a, *Sammlung antiker Vasen und Terracotten im K. K. Oesterreich. Mus.*; published in *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, 1890–91, pl. 11, 1. Vid. also s. v. Io in Roscher's *Lexikon*.

3. *Tydeus.*

λέοντος δέρος ἔχων ἐπ' ἀσπίδι
χαίτῃ πεφρικός· δεξιᾷ δὲ λαμπάδα
Τιτὰν Προμηθεὺς ἔφερεν ὡς πρήσων πόλιν.

This decoration, we may conclude, was thought of as painted on the shield. The author no doubt simply meant 'a lion of bristling hide,' instead of which he has merely written the 'bristling hide,' a characteristic turn with which one may compare the picturesque description of Herakles dressed in the Nemean lion's skin [1]. The shield devices on the vase paintings show innumerable instances of this thing from the earliest times [2]. So, again, one meets an ordinary and popular motive. That Tydeus acted a veritable Titan with the torch in his right hand to fire the city may be compared with Aischylos' account of Kapaneus' shield [3].

4. *Polyneikes.*

Ποτνιάδες δ' ἐπ' ἀσπίδι
ἐπίσημα πῶλοι δρομάδες ἐσκίρτων φόβῳ,
εὖ πως στρόφιγξιν ἔνδοθεν κυκλούμεναι
πόρπαχ' ὑπ' αὐτόν, ὥστε μαίνεσθαι δοκεῖν.

In this device it appears as though Euripides

[1] *Her. Fur.* vs. 361 ff.

[2] Gerhard, *Auserl. Vasen.* pl. 92 on Achilles' shield, *ibid.* pl. 84–85; *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, 1890–91, pl. 8, 2[b].

[3] Cf. p. 24 above.

had in mind Tydeus' shield in the *Septem*[1]. From underneath this (*ὑπό*) bells wrought of bronze rung and rattled. So with the wild mares fastened on pegs *inside right by the handle*, one finds much the same invention. The bells must be thought of as a sort of fringe to the outer edge of the shield; the horses too could be imagined in the same way serving as a kind of border, the heads of course peeping out from the inside of the shield. The mechanical part of such a contrivance offers considerable difficulty. It was, to be sure, possible but not practical. I know no analogous arrangement on any vase painting. One may account for the invention by giving Aischylos the credit of the novel idea.

5. *Kapaneus.*

σιδηρονώτοις δ' ἀσπίδος τύποις ἐπῆν
γίγας ἐπ' ὤμοις γηγενὴς ὅλην πόλιν
φέρων μοχλοῖσιν ἐξανασπάσας βάθρων.

The shield was covered with reliefs (*τύποι*) in iron — a Giant carrying a whole city on his shoulders. The effect of the picture fits in well with what one hears of Kapaneus' daring. It is instructive to note that cumbrous designs in

[1] vs. 385 f.

metal, or in a form of relief, actually do appear on shields. Snakes in numerous coils and far extended neck and jaws are to be seen on shields which are in the clash of an engagement[1].

If such devices were really in use their inconvenience was surely not much less than that of the two shields above. Medusa heads stand out in high relief on other paintings of a much later time[2]. A closer parallel to the designs under discussion is found on a Naples vase, where one meets the fore parts of a large Gryphon apparently leaping out of the centre of the shield[3]. These and other similar motives are surely ample proof that the poet has not gone much further in his creations than the artist did.

6. *Adrastos.*

ἑκατὸν ἐχίδναις ἀσπίδ' ἐκπληροῦν γραφῇ
ὕδρας ἔχων λαιοῖσιν ἐν βραχίοσιν
Ἀργεῖον αὔχημ'· ἐκ δὲ τειχέων μέσων
δράκοντες ἔφερον τέκνα Καδμείων γνάθοις.

[1] Cf. *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, 1890–91, pl. 6, 1ᵉ and 3; also Gerhard, *Auserl. Vasen*. pl. 117–118 and 148. These are all black figured vases.

[2] Cf. *Mon. d. Inst.* iv. pl. 18. Date of vase *cir.* 430 B.C. Cf. Furtwängler, *Masterpieces*, p. 109. Another in *Mon. d. Inst.* ix. pl. 6 = Roscher's *Lexikon*, i. p. 1658. Numerous rays extend from the head at a considerable angle from the surface of the shield.

[3] Published in *Mon. d. Inst.* ix. pl. 6, same as last in note 2.

It is expressly stated in this case that the device was done as a painting, and we have no difficulty in finding examples of the 'Hydra with its hundred heads' serving as a blazon on shields. In the period of severe red figured vases it is not an uncommon occurrence[1]. Euripides is here on solid ground. He needed but to use his eyes when examining the vases in order to discover just the figure he introduced. The dragons who carried the Kadmeian children off in their jaws tell us in another way the story of the Sphinx which served Aischylos on the shield of Parthenopaios[2].

Where Aischylos and Euripides went over the same ground as they did in the matter of these shield designs, one has an unusually good opportunity to compare the artistic taste of the two. It must be borne in mind that the older poet belonged to quite a different age in the history of Greek art, and that therefore he can not be required to exhibit the cultivated judgement of the younger poet who breathed under the influence of the Pheidian age. On the other hand, he was first in the field and was

[1] Hartwig's *Meisterschalen*, pl. 12 and 17. 3, and the Chachrylion kylix, *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, ser. v. pl. 3.

[2] Cf. p. 27 above.

untrammeled by precedent and he was free to use the motives that pleased him, while the latter was evidently conscious at every step that the standard of designs had long since been established by the author of the *Septem.* Notwithstanding this, we are able to discern very clearly where Euripides is himself. Where Aischylos introduced the strange, terrible, and mysterious that struck the people with horror, and taught them anew the severe type of character which he was, Euripides set allegory aside, and selected for the most part motives that came out of the common stock of artistic themes. He had more interest in the seen than the unseen. His pictures had no moral lesson behind them which needed long study and thought. The figures of the warrior scaling the walls, of the naked man with flaming torch, crying 'I'll burn the city,' and again of Justice restoring the outcast to his ancestral rights, speak to us of the Olympic power in Aischylos, but do not impress us as being creations of an artist or of one essentially influenced by art. When we pass to Euripides, his Hydra, Kalydonian Hunt, and story of Argos, so far from arousing our apprehension, remind us only of the countless subjects of popular interest that had gone the length and

breadth of Hellas and been carried to the extremest parts where Greek art had penetrated. His designs are more largely the product of an active observer of the things which interested the many.

In order that we may obtain a still clearer picture of the relation of the tragedians to Greek art, it remains to review, as briefly as possible, the scenes mentioned by Aischylos and Euripides.

The allegorical figures on the shields of Aischylos can not be said to have belonged to the development of Greek art. If such made their appearance in isolated cases, they were never an essential part of the nation's artistic life. The Phineus-Harpy scene would appear to have belonged more to the period of archaic art than to the subsequent time. Only two of the five vases representing the episode fall within the second half of the fifth century B.C. The sacrifice of Iphigeneia is of larger interest and can justly be called fifth-century in its feeling. It may be older than Aischylos, and is at any rate traceable down to the time of the Pompeian wall paintings. The Sphinx on the shield can be assigned to no one period or century. It was a motive which occurred

everywhere. A warrior storming a city's wall, possibly meant for Kapaneus, can hardly be older than the drama. The monuments at least are later. The ugly Typhoeus, as Aischylos pictured him on the shield, is essentially an archaic figure. Dikē, too, was as old as the Kypselos Chest and is not traceable after Aischylos' time, although we have no right to conclude that this personification did not continue till a much later time. Small though this number of scenes is which the poet has in common with the actually existing monuments, it seems to me clear that one is justified in looking upon Aischylos as particularly in sympathy with the past; the artistic in him is not of the popular sort. He employed art far less for art's sake than for the lesson which he was able to teach through it. It made little difference whether the subject was particularly archaic so long as it served his purpose. He was not by any means the first to lay the old aside.

When we come to the art of Euripides we have crossed a wondrous gulf. His back was turned on the past and his face was directed towards the rising sun of the fourth century. One has but to recall the following in order to see how closely he stood to the artistic life

of the fifth century: the metopes at Delphi—Herakles and the Hydra, Bellerophon and the Chimaira, Athena and Enkelados, Bakchos and the giant; the devices on the shields—the Kalydonian Hunt, the Hydra, and the Argos. Each and all of these subjects were shown to have been of unusually frequent occurrence, not only in the time of the poet but throughout the period of the rise and decline of Attic art. The picture of Erichthonios' birth was particularly fifth-century in its development. The appearance of Helios, Selene, Nyx, and Eos in their chariots became, so far as one can judge from the vase paintings, of far-reaching importance from about the middle of the century, and we have had occasion to observe how much Euripides was interested in just this form of personification. That he was especially under the influence of Pheidias and the Parthenon has already been pointed out. There are, however, in his work further indications of this fact. This is nowhere more evident than in the description of the Apollo temple at Delphi. The extended account of its sculptures was plainly inspired by the recently completed Parthenon. The gable group he refers to was bounded by Helios and Selene, or Nyx, as was that of the east pediment of the

Parthenon. Even more convincing than this is the fact that Euripides calls Prometheus the deliverer of Zeus[1]. This is strong evidence that the central group of the east gable by Pheidias represented Prometheus in the room occupied by Hephaistos on the black figured Attic vases. Pheidias had followed the Attic legend, however, and made the Attic hero Prometheus direct the blow which brought Athena from the head of Zeus[2]. The work of the great sculptor captivated Euripides, who likewise assigns the honourable position to Prometheus. He never would have dared to do this in a tragedy whose chief aim was to glorify Athens and her history, if he had not been in harmony with the greatest of Attic monuments which told the story of the birth. One has further to remember that the helm of Achilles in the *Elektra* was borrowed, with modifications, from the Parthenos. It is again instructive to note

[1] *Ion*, vs. 455 f.

[2] Cf. Schneider, *Die Geburt der Athena*, p. 32 ff. The relief on the Madrid *Puteal* is the most authentic record of the central group of the east gable, and the youthful, muscular figure behind Zeus can, as I believe, be none other than Prometheus. The relief is published by Schneider, *op. cit.* pl. i. 1. (No. 2 gives the Tegel replica of the same on which the head of Prometheus is better preserved.) Also in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, i. fig. 172 = *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, viii. pl. 11. 3.

that the only references in Greek tragic literature to the Panathenaic Peplos, the delivery of which I believe is the subject of the central scene in the east frieze of the Parthenon, occur in Euripides[1]. Less can not be said of him, therefore, in view of all these facts than that he was immeasurably influenced by Pheidias and his circle.

I shall bring this study to an end by a brief discussion of art in the *Rhesos*. It is not my intention to enter upon any restatement of the endless number of arguments which touch the authorship of this play. The last verse of the work has been long since turned over by the philologists and sounded for its secrets. It would be difficult to discover any fresh forage in this particular field if one were hunting for philological fodder. One set of scholars is of the firm opinion that Euripides had nothing to do with the tragedy, and a large number of these would even come late into the next century before consenting to name any possible date. Another set, who have been, and are, in the minority, hold to Euripides as the author[2]. So

[1] *Hek.* v. 466 f.; *Iph. T.* vs. 222 f.

[2] Rolfe in *Harvard Class. Studies*, 1893, p. 61 ff. gives the most succinct presentation of the whole discussion.

the question hangs in the balance, always interesting and yet never likely to be settled one way or another. Whatever arguments one presents, they are based on internal evidence of the play compared with the extant works of the three tragedians. Is the play Aischylean, Sophoklean or Euripidean? And if it is not any of the three, what element predominates in it? I propose to answer this question as far as the art element is concerned. No one can fail to see that I have brought out in the preceding pages well-established characteristics in the style of the three great tragedians, which have never been borne in mind by the critics who have dealt with the authorship of the *Rhesos*. No amount of theory will get one away from the language of an author, and the peculiar traits which have been pointed out as belonging to one poet or the other are reliable criteria. It is an indisputable fact that Sophokles had as good as nothing to say of anything artistic, while Euripides always preferred this sort of thing wherever it was possible to make use of it. Where this element occurs therefore it is proof, not to be challenged, that we need not deceive ourselves by thinking the author Sophokles. But to turn directly to

the play, let us see what secrets it has in this particular.

One of the most striking features of the whole is the splendor in which the Thracian King Rhesos makes his appearance. His shield, πέλτη, glistens with decorations fastened on in gold[1]. *A bronze Gorgon, attached as a frontlet for his horse, is like the aigis of the goddess*[2]. The snakes around it strike terror into the spectator. Again, he is simply wrought in gold[3]. He is armored in gold[4]. Then he speaks of himself as passing a sleepless night in his great mantle[5]. Now what have we here in πόρπαμα other than the huge Thracian coat which Xenophon described[6], and which we know from the monuments was a common sight in Athens from the beginning of the fifth century B.C. till at least the time of the Parthenon Frieze? It has been pointed out that the fashion of this Thracian coat in Athens was confined to about this period[7], and the fact that the author of the play brings in the king in this costume in an Attic theatre argues somewhat for the time when this dress was in vogue in Athens. The earliest examples of the πόρπαμα

[1] v. 305. [2] v. 306. [3] v. 340.
[4] v. 383. [5] v. 442. [6] *Anab.* 7. 4. 4.
[7] Furtwängler in 50th Berlin *Winckelmannsprogramm*, p. 160.

appear on vases painted by the set of Euphronios[1]. The fashion was surely not long lived and never seems to have reached far into the second half of the century. My conclusion is that a play which introduced a Thracian with all the display of his national costume would have been particularly well received during this period. It must also be remembered in this connexion that Aischylos' Tetralogy, the *Lykurgeia*, was a product of that time[2] when Athens was largely concerned with Thracian customs and the Athenians were becoming familiar with Thracian life. Another point about the *Lykurgeia*, which would suggest an influence over the *Rhesos*, is that in all three pieces the scene was a tent at Troy. There is, then, in the representation of the big mantle on the vases and

[1] *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, ser. vi. pl. 5, shows a Duris kylix which is the oldest example for the Thracian cap, ἀλωπεκῆ. Cf. Furtwängler, *loc. cit.* for reference to the following: *Arch. Ztg.* 1868, pl. 3; Gerhard, *Trinkschalen und Gefässe*, pl. J.; Gerhard's *Auserl. Vasen.* pl. 164. Cf. also *Winckelmannsprogramm*, 1890, pl. 2. These are all without exception Orpheus scenes, and the Thracians who are hanging on his music have the native mantle. This led Furtwängler to conclude that this dress appears complete, cap and all, only in the representation of this scene. That the costume appears elsewhere is shown by the Onesimos kylix in the Castellani collection in Rome; vid. Hartwig's *Meisterschalen*, pl. 54. There are here four full-dressed Thracians who are serving as mere decorative figures.

[2] The *Lykurgeia* is to be placed in the years 465-458 B.C.

the influence of Aischylos everything that harmonizes with the grammarian who calls the *Rhesos* an early work of Euripides. The mounted Thracian in the inside picture of the Onesimos kylix is a glorious example of the pomp which the author of the *Rhesos* assigns to the king. I cannot help feeling that the period which knew at Athens such a rider as this figure of the vase painter was the same as that in which the splendidly caparisoned Rhesos was introduced to the Athenian audience.

The reference to the Athena Aigis, and the knowing manner in which it is done, is evidence also of the strongest nature for Euripides. This was, we might say, his own speciality. No other Greek poet was so deeply concerned in the goddess as she appeared in Art, and in her famous armor[1]. This verse alone would exclude Sophokles as author, as well as any one who had been seriously under his influence. Of course, any or many of the tragedians whose works have not reached us may have written in the artistic vein of Euripides. We cannot therefore claim this as conclusive evidence for Euripidean authorship. Still when viewed in the light of the foregoing pages this part of the

[1] Cf. p. 59 f. above.

play must be admitted to possess the true Euripidean ring. The description is artistic exactly in the manner of this poet, and any one who appreciates this side of him cannot close his eyes to the fact that, in this particular, the author of the *Ion* and that of the *Rhesos* manifest one and the same trait.

In v. 225 the temple of Apollo is referred to by the regular Euripidean word *ναός*. The temple of Athena at Troy is *σηκός*[1], as was that of Demeter and Korē at Eleusis[2]. The temple image *ἄγαλμα*[3] is not omitted. And lastly, another cult which reminds one of Euripides is that of the Argive Hera. This great shrine inspired him more than once[4].

My task is ended. I am not concerned with parallels outside of this limit. The result is plain. Those who believe Euripides to be the author of the *Rhesos* have a very strong argument on their side in the artistic allusions in the play. Notwithstanding all that has been said to point out why Euripides could not have written the work, nothing can be brought forward to overthrow the fact that a poet of artistic tastes like Euripides was the author of the *Rhesos*.

[1] v. 501. [2] *Supp.* v 30. [3] v. 502.
[4] *Troad.* v. 23 f.; *Iph. T.* v. 221.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

GENERAL INDEX

ἄγαλμα, sense of, 6 f., 59, 75, 117.
Achilles, armor of, 92 f.
Aigis, 84, 114.
Athena, image of in the *Eumen.*, 9 f., 'Old Temple' of, 8, 43, 45 note 2: on a chariot, 71 f.
βρέτας, sense of, 6 f., use of in *Iph. T.*, 61 f.
γραφή, 22, 75.
Daidalos, 64 f.
Delphi, Apollo Temple at, 41, 47 f.
Erechtheion, 34 f., and 44.
Erichthonios, birth of, 76 f.
ἱππαλεκτρυών, 31 f.
Iphigeneia, sacrifice of, 17 f.
Kyklops, 58 f.
Metopes, 46 f.
Nikē Temple, date of, 87, note 2.
Panathenaic Peplos, 112.
Pan's grotto, 42 f.
παραστάς, 56.
Parthenos, 59 f., 97 f.
Personification, 29 f., 83 f., 95.
Phineus, episode of, 12 ff., and 108.
Prometheus in E. gable of Parthenon, 111.
Propylaia, paintings in, 66.
σηκός, 57, 117.
Shields, devices of, 22 f., 92, 99, 101 f.
Sphinx, 27 f., 97 f.
Stars on vases, 24.
Thracians, costume of, 114 f.
ὕφασμα, 21, 80 f.

INDEX OF PASSAGES DISCUSSED

Aischylos.

Agam., vs. 416 f., p. 5 f. : v. 240, p. 17 f.
Eumen., v. 80, p. 9 f. : vs. 46 f., p. 12 f.
Septem, vs. 116 f., p. 11 f. : vs. 388 f., p. 22 : vs. 432, p. 24 f. : vs. 466 f., p. 25 f. : vs. 493 f., p. 26 f. : vs. 541 f., p. 27 f. : vs. 644 f., p. 29 f.
Supp. vs. 211 f., p. 11.

Sophokles.

Oed. Rex, v. 20, p. 34 f. Frag. no. 1025, p. 37.

Euripides.

Alk., vs. 348 f., p. 67 f.
Andromache, vs. 1111 f., p. 56 f.
Andromeda, frag. 125, p. 68 f.
Elekt., vs. 1254 f., p. 60 f. : vs. 718 f., p. 90 f. : vs. 432 f., p. 91 f.
Eurystheus, frag. 372, p. 64.
Hek., vs. 466 f., p. 89 f. : vs. 558 f., p. 65 f.
Hipp., vs. 30 f., p. 45 f. : v. 1005 f., p. 73.
Hypsipyle, frag. 764, p. 57 f.
Ion, vs. 184 f., pp. 41 and 48 f. : vs. 267 f., p. 76 f. : vs. 492 f., p. 42 f. : vs. 1122–1166, p. 80 f. : vs. 1412 f., p. 88 f.
Iph. A., vs. 250 f., p. 70 f.
Iph. T., vs. 811 f., p. 90 f.
Phoin., vs. 1107 f., p. 101 f.
Rhesos, vs. 305 f., p. 114 f.
Troades, vs. 686 f., p. 73.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

OXFORD: HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

RENEWALS ONLY - Tel. No. 642-3405

TCLF (N)

APR 15 1978
MAR 16 '78
REC. CIR.

AUG 28 1968

AUG 26 '68 -6 PM
LOAN DEPT.
JAN 22 1973 54
APR 16 1973
REC'D LD JUN 11 '73-5 PM 94

LD 21A–10*m*-1,'68
(H7452s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

YB 17650